



History after Othman's Death

The One in Need of Allah
8th of March 2025

In the name of Allah the Most Merciful and Compassionate

We start...:

The Muslims faced a great trial due to the killing of the caliph **‘Uthmān**, may Allah be pleased with him. They had experienced the transition of power after the death of the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him, and after the death of **al-Ṣiddīq**, may Allah be pleased with him. However, they were now facing a new experience, where violence was used to change authority, resulting in the murder of the caliph and the position remaining vacant. The opposition sought to pledge allegiance to one of the senior Companions to fill the power vacuum. They offered it to **Ṭalḥa** and **‘Abdullāh ibn ‘Umar**, but no one among them was willing to accept authority under the conditions of turmoil, as they did not represent the nation. Instead, the nation was represented by the senior Companions in **al-Madīnah**, whose selection would be accepted by the people across the state. The opposition realized this after their attempts failed. [Faḍā’il al-Ṣaḥābah by Imām Aḥmad (2/573-574)].

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafiyyah said: "I was with my father when **‘Uthmān**, may Allah be pleased with him, was killed. He got up and entered his house. Then, the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, peace and blessings be upon him, came to him and said: 'This man has been killed, and the people must have a leader. Today, we find no one more deserving of this matter than you, in terms of precedence and closeness to the Messenger of Allah, peace and blessings be upon him.' He replied: 'Do not do this, for being a minister is better for me than being a leader.' They said: 'No, by Allah! We will not stop until we pledge allegiance to you.' He said: 'Then, let it be in the mosque, for my pledge of allegiance should not be done secretly and should only be with the consent of the Muslims.'" **Sālim ibn Abī al-Ja’d** said: "'**Abdullāh ibn ‘Abbās**, may Allah be pleased with them, said: 'I disliked that he should go to the mosque for fear that trouble would arise against him.' However, he insisted on the mosque. When the Muhājirūn and Anṣār entered, they pledged allegiance to him, and then the people pledged allegiance to him as well."

There is another narration from **Abū Bashīr al-‘Ābidī**, in which he says: "The Muhājirūn and Anṣār, including **Ṭalḥa** and **al-Zubayr**, came to ‘**Alī** and said: 'The people will not be in order except under a leadership, and the matter has been prolonged.' He said to them: 'You have come to me and visited me repeatedly. I will say something to you: if you accept it, I will take on your matter; if not, then I have no need for it.' They said: 'Whatever you say, we will accept, if Allah wills.' So they pledged allegiance to him in the mosque."

Another narration states that **Ṭalḥa** and **al-Zubayr** said: "O ‘**Alī**, extend your hand," and so **Ṭalḥa** and **al-Zubayr** pledged allegiance to him. This was after **eighteen nights** had passed since the killing of ‘**Uthmān**. Another narration from ‘**Awf ibn Abī Jamīlah al-‘Abdī** states: "I bear witness that I heard **Muḥammad ibn Sīrīn** say: '‘**Alī** came and said to **Ṭalḥa**: "Extend your hand, O **Ṭalḥa**, so that I may pledge allegiance to you." **Ṭalḥa** replied: "You are more deserving; you are the Commander of the Believers, so extend your hand." So, ‘**Alī** extended his hand, and **Ṭalḥa** pledged allegiance to him.'" All of these are found in **al-Ṭabarī's Tārīkh** (4/427-428) and (4/434), as well as in *Faḍā'il al-Ṣaḥābah* by **Imām Aḥmad** (2/573).

Ibn Sa‘d mentioned in *al-Ṭabaqāt* (3/31) that ‘**Alī**, may Allah be pleased with him, was pledged allegiance to as caliph on **Friday in the year 35 AH**, and he listed among those who pledged allegiance: **Ṭalḥa**, **al-Zubayr**, and a group of the Companions who were in **al-Madīnah**.

al-Mas‘ūdī mentioned in *Murūj al-Dhahab* (p. 358) that ‘**Alī** was given a private pledge of allegiance on the day ‘**Uthmān ibn ‘Affān**, may Allah be pleased with him, was killed. Then he said that the general pledge of allegiance took place **four days after ‘Uthmān's** murder.

al-Ya‘qūbī mentioned in his *Tārīkh* (1/178) that **Ṭalḥa** and **al-Zubayr** pledged allegiance to ‘**Alī**, and the first to pledge allegiance was **Ṭalḥa ibn ‘Ubaydillāh**, may Allah be pleased with him.

al-Ḥāfiẓ al-Dhahabī says in *Duwal al-Islām* (1/28) regarding the pledge: "When ‘**Uthmān** was killed, the people came to ‘**Alī** and said: 'The people must have a leader.' **Ṭalḥa**,

al-Zubayr, Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqāṣ, and the notable figures were present, and the first to pledge allegiance to him was **Ṭalḥa**, followed by the rest of the people."

As for the opposing narrations that **Imām al-Ṭabarī** transmitted in his *Tārīkh* (4/429), (4/431), and (4/435), some of them claim that **Ṭalḥa** and **al-Zubayr** pledged allegiance under coercion. Among these is a narration from **al-Zuhri**, who said: "The people pledged allegiance to **ʿAlī ibn Abī Ṭālib**, so he sent for **al-Zubayr** and **Ṭalḥa** and invited them to pledge allegiance. **Ṭalḥa** hesitated, so **al-Ashtar** drew his sword and said: 'By Allah, you will pledge allegiance, or I will strike your head between your eyes.' **Ṭalḥa** said: 'Where can I escape from it!' So he pledged allegiance, and so did **al-Zubayr** and the people." There are other reports that indicate they pledged allegiance while the sword was above their necks.

All these reports are **not authentic** because they come from **al-Wāqidī** and **Abū Mikhnaf**, who are known to be **fabricators**.

Ibn al-ʿArabī states in *al-Awāṣim min al-Qawāṣim* (p. 148) regarding this: "If **Ṭalḥa** had said: 'I pledged allegiance while the noose was on my neck,' we say: This fabricated narration was invented by someone who wanted to claim that there is a special dialect for the word 'noose' as 'quffī,' just as some say 'hawī' instead of 'hawā.' But this is the dialect of **Hudhayl**, not **Quraysh**, making it an unthoughtful lie."

As for the statement that **Ṭalḥa** pledged allegiance with a **paralyzed hand**, implying that his allegiance would not last, **Ibn al-ʿArabī** refutes this in *al-Awāṣim* (p. 148-149), saying: "The hand that was paralyzed in defense of the Messenger of Allah, peace and blessings be upon him, deserves to be honored and have every matter fulfilled through it. The decree was executed as predestined, and the innovator who fabricated this claim did not realize that he was proving the opposite of what he intended."

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Kathīr mentioned in *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* (7/230):

"As for what is claimed that Ṭalḥa and al-Zubayr pledged allegiance unwillingly, it is not established. Rather, they pledged allegiance willingly and voluntarily. However, they later sought permission from ʿAlī to go to Makkah for ʿUmrah, and he permitted them."

Al-Ḥāfiẓ Ibn Ḥajar mentioned in *Fath al-Bārī* (13/59):

"The claim that Ṭalḥa pledged allegiance unwillingly is not authentic."

This confirms that the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, pledged allegiance to 'Alī, may Allah be pleased with him, willingly and without coercion.

And as for the statement of those who said: *"He pledged allegiance to 'Alī with a withered hand"*—referring to Ṭalḥa's hand—*"By Allah, this matter will never be completed!"*

Ibn al-ʿArabī said in *al-ʿAwāṣim* (pp. 148–149) regarding this:

"As for the one who said, 'a withered hand and an affair that will not be completed,' indeed, a hand that withered while shielding the Messenger of Allah, peace and blessings be upon him, is one for which every affair will be completed and by which every harm will be ward off. And indeed, the matter was completed in its due course, and destiny was carried out in accordance with its decree. Yet the innovator was ignorant of this and thus fabricated what stands as evidence against him."

In the narration of **Ibn Shabbah**, as reported by **al-Ṭabarī** in his *Tārīkh* (4/429),

Muḥammad ibn al-Ḥanafīyyah said:

"The Anṣār pledged allegiance to 'Alī, except for a small number."

And among those mentioned were: **Saʿd ibn Abī Waqqāṣ**, **Ibn ʿUmar**, **Usāmah ibn Zayd**, **Muḥammad ibn Maslamah**, and others.

I say: This is not correct, for their presence before 'Alī and their excuse for not standing with him in his war against the people of Shām or in the conflicts that arose between him and the Muslims in Iraq is clear proof that they had already pledged allegiance to him and were bound by obedience to him when they presented their excuses. Had it been otherwise, they would have simply left him without going to him to offer any justification, as they would not have been obligated to obey him.

Al-Bāqillānī justifies the stance of the Companions who refrained from supporting **‘Alī**, saying in *al-Tamhīd fī al-Radd ‘alā al-Mulḥidah* (pp. 233–234):

*"If someone says: 'If the Imamate of ‘Alī is as valid and established as you have described, then what do you say about the delay of **Sa‘d, Ibn ‘Umar, Ibn Maslamah, Usāmah**, and others in supporting him and entering into his obedience?' It is said to him: None of those who refrained, whether those we named or others we omitted, ever impugned his Imamate or believed in its invalidity. Rather, they refrained from supporting him in fighting the Muslims out of fear and to avoid sin in that matter."*

Ibn al-‘Arabī states in *al-‘Awāṣim* (p. 150):

*"Some have said that a group of the Companions refrained from supporting him, including **Sa‘d, Ibn Maslamah, Ibn ‘Umar, and Usāmah**."*

He refutes this by saying:

"We say: As for the pledge of allegiance, none of them refrained from it. As for supporting him, some refrained, including those you mentioned, because it was a matter of independent reasoning (ijtihād), and each one exercised his judgment and acted accordingly within his capacity."

In conclusion, even if some reports exclude certain Companions from the pledge of allegiance, this does not undermine the Caliphate of **‘Alī**, may Allah be pleased with him.

And if it is established that **Mu‘āwiyah** refused to pledge allegiance to him, this does not undermine the consensus of the people of authority and decision-making (*ahl al-ḥall wa al-‘aqd*) regarding his Caliphate, just as **Sa‘d ibn ‘Ubādah**’s refusal to pledge allegiance did not undermine the consensus on the Caliphate of **Abū Bakr**. Moreover, **Mu‘āwiyah** acknowledged that **‘Alī** was more deserving of the Imamate than he was; his only argument for refusal was his demand for the handover of those involved in the killing of **‘Uthmān** so that he could exact retribution upon them.

Al-Māwardī concludes in *al-Aḥkām al-Sulṭāniyyah* (p. 30):

"The obligation of appointing an Imam or pledging allegiance is a communal obligation (farḍ kifāyah), like jihad and seeking knowledge. If those qualified for it fulfill this duty, its obligation is lifted from the rest of the people."

After assuming the Caliphate, ‘**Alī** dismissed some governors and appointed others in their place. He removed **Khālīd ibn al-‘Āṣ**, the governor of Makkah, and appointed **Abū Qatādah al-Anṣārī** for two months before replacing him with **Qutham ibn al-‘Abbās**. It appears that public opinion in Makkah was sympathetic to ‘**Uthmān**, and the anger intensified due to the influx of people from Madīnah to Makkah following the rebels' control over the city. (*Tārīkh Khalīfah*, pp. 178, 201; *‘Aṣr al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah* by Akram al-‘Umārī, pp. 139–146).

He sent ‘**Uthmān ibn Ḥunayyf al-Anṣārī** as governor of Basra in place of ‘**Abdullāh ibn ‘Āmir**, who had left for Makkah. Basra was divided over the new governor—some pledged allegiance, some remained neutral, and some refused until the killers of ‘**Uthmān** were executed. (*Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā*, 2/322).

As for Egypt, its governor, ‘**Abdullāh ibn Sa‘d ibn Abī Sarḥ**, had left for Ascalon, and **Muḥammad ibn Abī Ḥudhayfah** took control of it for a year. He faced opposition demanding retribution for the killers of ‘**Uthmān**. When he was killed, **Qays ibn Sa‘d ibn ‘Ubādah** took over, secured allegiance for ‘**Alī**, and reached a truce with its people. (*Muṣannaf ‘Abd al-Razzāq*, 5/458, with an authentic chain to al-Zuhrī).

‘**Alī** sent to **Mu‘āwiyah**, requesting his allegiance. **Mu‘āwiyah** responded:

"If you are truthful, then allow us to seize the killers of ‘Uthmān so that we may exact retribution from them, and we will be the swiftest of people to pledge allegiance to you." (*al-Akḥbār al-Ṭiwāl* by al-Dīnawarī, pp. 162–163).

If someone says: "‘**Alī** erred in dismissing all of ‘**Uthmān**'s governors before receiving the allegiance of the people of the provinces," then the answer is that ‘**Alī**, may Allah be pleased with him, was a mujtahid Imam who had the right to dismiss ‘**Uthmān**'s officials if he deemed it in the best interest. The Messenger of Allah, peace and blessings be upon him, appointed **Khālīd ibn Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ** over Ṣan‘ā’ and ‘**Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ** over ‘Umān, but **Abū Bakr** dismissed them. **Abū Bakr** also appointed **Khālīd ibn al-Walīd** and **al-Muthannā ibn Ḥārithah**, but ‘**Umar** dismissed them.

Likewise, ‘Umar appointed ‘Amr ibn al-‘Āṣ and al-Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah, but ‘Uthmān dismissed them. (*Tārīkh Khalīfah*, pp. 97, 102, 122–123, 155, 178; *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, 3/343, 4/241).

Thus, ‘Alī did the same when he saw benefit in it. Would any rational person criticize **Abū Bakr**, ‘Umar, and ‘Uthmān for their dismissals?

At this point, after ‘Alī (may Allah be pleased with him) had encamped at **al-Rabadhah**, he sent two messengers to mobilize the people of **al-Kūfah**: **Muḥammad ibn Abī Bakr** and **Muḥammad ibn Ja‘far**. However, they failed in their mission because **Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī**, the governor of **al-Kūfah** appointed by ‘Alī, had taken a stance of abstention from the conflict and warned the people against participating in it. *Sunan Abī Dāwūd* (4/459-460) with a sound chain of transmission.

And this report is supported by what **al-Bukhārī** narrated in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* (13/58) through the route of **Abū Wā‘il**, who said: **Abū Mūsā** and **Abū Mas‘ūd** entered upon ‘Ammār when ‘Alī sent him to the people of **al-Kūfah** to mobilize them. They said: “We have never seen you take a course of action more disliked by us than your hastiness in this matter since you became Muslim.” ‘Ammār replied: “I have never seen from you both, since I became Muslim, anything more disliked by me than your slowness in this matter.” Then he gifted them a garment, and they went to the mosque.

Then ‘Alī moved toward **Dhī Qār**, which is a water source belonging to **Bakr ibn Wā‘il**, near **al-Kūfah**—*Mu‘jam al-Buldān* by **Yāqūt al-Ḥamawī** (4/293-294)—where he encamped. From there, he sent ‘**Abd Allāh ibn ‘Abbās**, followed by his son **al-Ḥasan** and ‘**Ammār ibn Yāsir**, to mobilize the people of **al-Kūfah**. *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/482) with a sound chain to **al-Zuhrī**, *mursal*, and *al-Faḥ* (13/63).

The reason for the change in the direction of the march was that ‘Alī (may Allah be pleased with him) heard news of the disturbances that had occurred in **al-Baṣrah**, which led to his governor being expelled from it.

Al-Bukhārī narrated in his *Ṣaḥīḥ* from **Abū Wā'il**, who said: When 'Alī sent 'Ammār and al-Ḥasan to al-Kūfah to mobilize them, 'Ammār gave a sermon, saying: *"I know that she is his wife in this world and the Hereafter, but Allah is testing you: will you follow him or her?"*

Al-Bukhārī also narrated from **Abū Maryam**, who said: When Ṭalḥah, al-Zubayr, and 'Ā'ishah set out for al-Baṣrah, 'Alī sent 'Ammār ibn Yāsir and al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī. They arrived in al-Kūfah, ascended the pulpit, and al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī stood at the top while 'Ammār stood below him. We gathered around them, and I heard 'Ammār say: *"Indeed, 'Ā'ishah has gone to al-Baṣrah. By Allah, she is the wife of your Prophet (ﷺ) in this world and the Hereafter, but Allah, Blessed and Exalted, is testing you: will you obey Him or her?"*

Al-Ḥāfiẓ said in *al-Fatḥ*: *"The intention of 'Ammār was that the correct stance in this incident was with 'Alī, while at the same time affirming that 'Ā'ishah had not left Islam nor ceased to be the wife of the Prophet (ﷺ) in Paradise. This demonstrates the fairness of 'Ammār and his strong commitment to truthfulness."*

He also said: *"Ibn Hubayrah commented that this hadith shows that 'Ammār was truthful and was not driven by personal bias to speak ill of his opponent. Rather, he attested to 'Ā'ishah's complete virtue despite their opposing sides in battle." See: al-Fatḥ (13/63).*

It is worth noting that 'Ammār (may Allah be pleased with him) spoke about 'Ā'ishah (may Allah be pleased with her) without knowledge of the true reason behind the departure of the **Companions of the Camel** (*Aṣḥāb al-Jamal*), which was their intent to bring about reconciliation among the people. See: *Istishhād 'Uthmān wa Waq'at al-Jamal* by **Khālīd al-Ghayth** (p.185).

When the delegation from al-Kūfah arrived at **Dhī Qār**, 'Alī addressed them, saying: *"O people of al-Kūfah, you have confronted the kings of Persia and shattered their forces. I have called upon you to witness alongside us our brothers from al-Baṣrah. If they return, that is what we desire. If they refuse, we will treat them with gentleness until they initiate oppression. And we will not abandon any course that leads to reconciliation except that*

we will prefer it over that which leads to corruption, if Allah wills." *al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* by Ibn Kathīr (7/237).

Some reports mention that after the **Companions of the Camel** left **Makkah** and approached **Awṭās**—a plain located along the route of the **Iraqi pilgrims** coming from **Najd**, approximately **143 km** northeast of **Makkah** (*Muʿjam al-Buldān* 1/281)—they veered off from it, avoiding the **al-Baṣrah** route while traveling alongside it until they reached **al-Baṣrah**.

This report, however, is not authentic regarding those noble Companions. It portrays the **Companions of the Camel**, who departed with the intention of reconciliation, as a rebellious faction against the caliphate, suggesting that their fear of ‘**Alī** (may Allah be pleased with him) caused them to avoid taking the direct route to **al-Baṣrah** so that he would not catch up with them.

Upon studying their actual route from **Makkah** to **al-Baṣrah**, it is evident that they followed the **al-Baṣrah** road without deviating from it, contrary to what the reports claimed.

The clarification of this is as follows:

A. Some reports claim that the **Companions of the Camel**, upon reaching **Awṭās**, veered off and abandoned the **al-Baṣrah** route. However, this is misleading, as it suggests that they deliberately avoided **al-Baṣrah**, whereas in reality, those traveling from **Makkah** to **al-Baṣrah** would naturally veer right at **Awṭās**, as the **Companions of the Camel** did. Conversely, those heading to **al-Kūfah** would veer left at **Awṭās**, since the roads to **al-Baṣrah** and **al-Kūfah** diverge in opposite directions from that point.

B. The authentic narration recorded by **Imām Aḥmad** states that the **dogs of al-Ḥawʿab** barked at ‘**Āʾishah** (may Allah be pleased with her) when she reached the territory of **Banū ʿĀmir**.

The **Banū ʿĀmir** are a branch of ‘**Āmir ibn Ṣaʿṣaʿah**, and **al-Ḥawʿab** is a well belonging to the **Banū Bakr ibn Kilāb**, a clan of ‘**Āmir ibn Ṣaʿṣaʿah** (*Muʿjam al-Buldān* 1/314). Since the **Banū Kilāb** resided in **Ḍariyyah** (*Kitāb al-Manāsik* by **al-Ḥarbī** p.612, *Muʿjam al-Buldān* 3/457), this means that **al-Ḥawʿab** was located in **Ḍariyyah**, which itself was

on the **Basran pilgrimage route** (*Kitāb al-Manāsik* p.594). This confirms that the **Companions of the Camel** followed the normal route from **Makkah** to **al-Baṣrah** without deviation, contrary to what some reports claimed.

For further discussion and critique of these narrations, see: *Istishhād ‘Uthmān wa Waq‘at al-Jamal* by **Khālid al-Ghayth** (pp.166-168).

So when the people settled in their positions and felt at ease, **‘Alī** went out, and **Ṭalḥah** and **al-Zubayr** also went out, and they met and spoke about their differences. They found no course of action better than reconciliation, so they parted on that agreement. **‘Alī** returned to his camp, and **Ṭalḥah** and **al-Zubayr** returned to their camp. **Ṭalḥah** and **al-Zubayr** then sent word to their prominent supporters, and **‘Alī** did the same, except to those who had besieged **‘Uthmān** (may Allah be pleased with him). The people went to sleep with the intention of peace and reconciliation, without any doubt about it. Some of them were positioned opposite others, and some were visiting one another, speaking only of peace and intending nothing else. They spent that night in the best state they had been in since the murder of **‘Uthmān**. However, those who had stirred the sedition spent the worst night they had ever known, for they foresaw their destruction. They deliberated amongst themselves throughout the night.

Refer to *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/506-507), narrated through the chain of **Sā’if ibn ‘Umar**.

They conspired to ignite the war in secret. So, at dawn, under the cover of darkness, before their neighbors were aware of them, they attacked with their swords. The people of **Basra** woke up to the battle, and every group rose to face those who had ambushed them. **Ṭalḥah** stood on his mount, calling out, "O people, will you listen?" But they swarmed around him and did not listen. All he could say was, "Alas! Alas! Moths of fire and flies of greed!" (*Tārīkh Khalīfah*, p. 182). And who could these "moths of fire and flies of greed" be other than the **Sab’iyyah** (followers of **‘Abdullāh ibn Saba’**)?

The fighting escalated due to the rabble, and matters spiraled out of the control of **‘Alī**, **Ṭalḥah**, and **al-Zubayr**. As **Ṭalḥah** was being struck by arrows, he kept repeating, "O Allah, take retribution from me today for **‘Uthmān**, until You are satisfied." (*Tārīkh Khalīfah*, p. 185; *Duwal al-Islām* by al-Dhahabī, 1/28).

al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī described the state of his father during the battle, saying: "I saw him when the fighting intensified—he was seeking refuge in me and saying, 'O Ḥasan, I wish I had died twenty Hajj seasons—or years—before this!' So I said, 'O father, I had advised you against this.' He replied, 'O my son, I did not expect matters to reach this point.'" (*Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah*, 15/288, with an authentic chain; *al-Sunnah* by ‘**Abdullāh ibn Aḥmad**, 2/566, 589).

Ibn Abī Shaybah also narrated in his *Muṣannaf* (15/275) through his chain from **Ḥabīb ibn Abī Thābit** that ‘**Alī** said on the Day of **al-Jamal**: "O Allah, this is not what I intended! O Allah, this is not what I intended!"

As for the reports that claim **Ṭalḥah** incited people to fight and was then struck and killed, they are rejected because of the established integrity of the Companions (may Allah be pleased with them). **Ṭalḥah** withdrew behind the army, and a stray arrow—its source unknown—struck him in the joint of his knee. This happened to be where he had been previously wounded during the Battle of **Uḥud** while fighting before the Messenger of Allah ﷺ. The wound reopened, and he began to bleed heavily. His servant carried him to **Basra**, where he took refuge in an abandoned house, and there he passed away (may Allah be pleased with him). (*Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī*, 4/512, 514, narrated through **Sā’if ibn ‘Umar**).

It has been said that the one who shot him with an arrow was **Marwan ibn al-Hakam**, but there is no evidence for this. Upon studying these narrations, it became evident that **Marwan ibn al-Hakam** was innocent of this accusation for the following reasons:

A- There is a narration from **Marwan ibn al-Hakam** in *Sahih al-Bukhari*, despite the well-known precision and strict verification of *al-Bukhari*, may Allah have mercy on him, regarding those whose narrations he accepted. Had it been true that **Marwan** killed **Talha**, may Allah be pleased with him, this would have been sufficient reason to reject his narration and impugn his integrity. The narration is found in *Sahih al-Bukhari* along with its commentary in *Fath al-Bari* (3/493).

B- **Ibn Kathir**, may Allah have mercy on him, in *al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya* (7/248), dismissed this claim and expressed doubt about it, saying: "It is said that the one who shot him with this arrow was **Marwan ibn al-Hakam**. However, it has also been said that someone else

shot him, and this, in my opinion, is more likely, even though the first claim is more well-known. And Allah knows best."

C- The praise of scholars for him, such as **Imam Ahmad** and **al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar**. See *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala* by **al-Dhahabi** (3/477) and *al-Isaba* by **Ibn Hajar** (6/257-259).

D- The invalidity of the alleged reason that **Marwan** killed **Talha**, may Allah be pleased with him, due to accusing **Talha** of aiding in the killing of **Uthman**, may Allah be pleased with him. This supposed reason is incorrect, as there is no authentic chain of transmission proving that any of the Companions aided in the killing of **Uthman**, may Allah be pleased with him.

E- The fact that **Marwan** and **Talha**, may Allah be pleased with them both, were on the same side during the *Battle of the Camel*, advocating for reconciliation among the people.

F- The fact that **Mu'awiya**, may Allah be pleased with him, appointed **Marwan** as governor over **Medina** and **Mecca**. For details on his appointment, see *Tarikh al-Tabari* (5/293). Had **Marwan** truly committed such an act, **Mu'awiya**, may Allah be pleased with him, would not have entrusted him with the governance of the Muslims and in the holiest places before Allah. For more details on this matter, refer to *Istishhad Uthman wa Waq'at al-Jamal* by **Khalid al-Ghayth** (pp. 202-203).

During the battle, **Ali** said to **al-Zubayr**: *"Do you remember when the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) said: 'O Zubayr, by Allah, you will fight him while being unjust to him.'"* (*Tarikh Dimashq* by **Ibn Asakir** (18/408-410)).

Al-Hakim narrated in *al-Mustadrak* (3/365-366) through multiple chains that **Ali** reminded **al-Zubayr** that the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) told him: *"You will fight Ali while being unjust to him,"* which led **al-Zubayr** to withdraw from the battle.

Ishaq narrated from **Isma'il ibn Abi Khalid** from **Abd al-Salam**, a man from his neighborhood, who said: *"Ali privately spoke to al-Zubayr on the day of the Camel and said: 'I adjure you by Allah, did you hear the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) say while you were twisting my hand: 'You will fight him while being unjust to*

him, and he will prevail over you"?' **Al-Zubayr** replied: 'Yes, I heard it. I will not fight you.' (Fath al-Bari (13/60), see also al-Matalib al-'Aliya (4/301)).

Ibn Asakir in *Tarikh Dimashq* (18/410) and **Ibn Kathir** in *al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya* (7/242) narrated that when **al-Zubayr**, may Allah be pleased with him, decided to return to **Medina**, his son **Abdullah** confronted him, asking: "What is the matter?" He replied: "**Ali** reminded me of a hadith I heard from the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him), so I am returning." His son said to him: "Did you come here for battle? You only came to reconcile between people, and Allah will rectify this matter."

Indeed, **al-Zubayr**, may Allah be pleased with him, remained committed to reconciliation until the last moment. This is supported by what **al-Hakim** narrated in *al-Mustadrak* (3/366) from **Abi Harb ibn Abi al-Aswad al-Dayli**, where it is mentioned that **al-Zubayr**, may Allah be pleased with him, strove for peace among the people, but when the battle erupted and the situation escalated, he withdrew from the fight.

This act of **al-Zubayr**, may Allah be pleased with him, aligns with his initial intention for traveling to **Basra**. This contradicts some narratives portraying him as an instigator of the battle.

As he withdrew, **Ibn Jurmuz** saw him, pursued him, and caught up with him while he was resting during the midday heat in **Wadi al-Siba'**. **Ibn Jurmuz** attacked and killed him, may Allah be pleased with him, then took his sword and armor (*al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Nihal* by **Ibn Hazm** (4/239)). **Ibn Kathir** mentioned that this is the most well-known account (*al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya* (7/250)).

Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar in *Fath al-Bari* (6/264-265) and (7/102) mentioned that **Ibn Jurmuz** came to **Ali** seeking closeness to him through this act. **Ali** took the sword in his hand and said: "How often did this sword relieve distress from the face of the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him)!" He then said: "Give the killer of **Ibn Safiyya** the news of Hellfire." See *Musnad Ahmad* (1/89, 102), authenticated by **al-Hakim** in *al-Mustadrak* (4/367), and mentioned by **Ahmad** in *Fada'il al-Sahaba* with a sound chain (2/736-737) with a similar wording: *"The killer of **al-Zubayr** seeks permission to enter." **Ali** said: "Let him enter." Then he added: "Let the killer of **al-Zubayr** enter Hell."

This narration is supported by what was reported by Imam Ahmad in *Fada'il al-Sahabah* (2/737) with a sound chain, which states that Ibn Jarmouz sought permission to enter upon **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him). When asked, "Who is it?" he replied, "Ibn Jarmouz seeks permission." **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) said: "Allow him to enter, for he is the killer of **Zubair**, and he will enter the Hellfire. I heard the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) say: 'Every Prophet has his companion, and my companion is **Zubair**.'"

In explaining the boldness of Ibn Jarmouz in killing **Zubair** (may Allah be pleased with him), **Al-Hafidh Abu Na'im al-Asfahani** mentions in *Kitab al-Imamah* (p. 322) that during the time of **Uthman** (may Allah be pleased with him), there were many who did not accompany the Messenger (peace be upon him), and the recognition of the virtues of the Companions (may Allah be pleased with them all) had been lost.

Here, **Ka'b ibn Sur** took the news to the Mother of the Believers, saying to her: "Hasten, the people are fighting." The battle was near **Basra**, so a howdah was placed upon the camel—reports mention the camel's name was '**Askar**—and **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her) sat in it, covered with armor, and went to the battlefield, hoping that when the people saw her, they would stop the fighting. Upon arrival, **Aisha** gave the Qur'an to **Ka'b** and said to him: "Let the camel go and advance, raise the Book of Allah and call them to it." The people of sedition feared that the fighting would cease if they allowed **Ka'b** to do what was requested. When **Ka'b** raised the Qur'an and began calling them, arrows were shot, and he was killed, as narrated in **al-Tabari** (4/513) through the chain of **Saif ibn Umar**, and **Ibn Asakir** in *Tareekh Dimashq* (7/88).

They then began throwing spears toward the camel, intending to kill **Aisha**, but Allah saved her. She began calling, "Stop the fighting," and **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) called from behind the army, "Stop the fighting," but the leaders of the sedition continued. The Mother of the Believers then began praying against the killers of **Uthman**, saying: "O Allah, curse the killers of **Uthman**." The army began to call along with her, and when **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) heard the people of **Basra** crying out during the battle, he asked, "What is this noise?" They replied, "**Aisha** is praying and they are praying with her against the killers of **Uthman** and their supporters." So **Ali** (may

Allah be pleased with him) called and said: "O Allah, curse the killers of **Uthman** and their supporters." **al-Tabari** (4/513).

Ibn Abi Shaybah narrated in *Al-Musannaf* (15/277) and **al-Bayhaqi** in *Al-Sunan al-Kubra* (8/181) that **Ali** heard on the day of **Al-Jamal** a sound directed towards the Mother of the Believers, so he said, "Look at what they are saying." They returned and reported, "They are shouting about the killers of **Uthman**." **Ali** said, "O Allah, bring shame upon the killers of **Uthman**."

This narration is further supported by what was reported by Imam Ahmad in *Fada'il al-Sahabah* (1/455) with a sound chain from **Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah**, who said: "It reached **Ali** that **Aisha** was cursing the killers of **Uthman** in **Al-Murbad**. So he raised his hands to his face and said: 'I too curse the killers of **Uthman**; may Allah curse them in the plains and the hills,' he said this twice or three times." The voices of prayer began to rise in both camps.

Al-Harith ibn Suwayd al-Kufi, a trustworthy and reliable eyewitness, said: "I saw us on the day of **Al-Jamal**, our spears and theirs clashing, and if it were not for the men, they would have rushed at us, shouting 'Allahu Akbar', 'Subhanallah', 'Allahu Akbar'." *Tareekh Khalifah* (p. 198) with a sound chain.

The people of sedition then began hurling spears at the camel of the Mother of the Believers, and **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) was shouting at them to stop attacking the camel, but they did not obey him, and the camel became like a porcupine due to the number of arrows stuck in it. *Tareekh al-Tabari* (4/513, 533) through **Saif ibn Umar**.

Al-Ashtar then approached the camel, and **Ibn al-Zubayr** stood before him, and they fought. There is a narration in **Ibn Abi Shaybah's** *Al-Musannaf* (11/108) and (15/257) with a chain of trustworthy narrators: **Al-Ashtar** and **Ibn al-Zubayr** met, and **Ibn al-Zubayr** said: "I did not strike him once until he struck me five or six times." He then said: "He threw me by my leg and said: 'By Allah, had it not been for your kinship to the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), I would have left no part of you intact with your companion.'" **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her) said: "Woe to **Asma**." It is then

narrated that later, the one who informed her that **Ibn al-Zubayr** was alive gave her a reward of ten thousand.

As for the story of the conflict between **Ibn al-Zubayr** and **Al-Ashtar** and **Ibn al-Zubayr's** words "Kill me and **Malik**", this contradicts the authentic narrations. **Al-Tabari** (4/520) narrates with a sound chain from **Alqama** that **Al-Ashtar** met **Ibn al-Zubayr** during **Al-Jamal**, and he said: "I was not content with the strength of my arms when I mounted and struck him on his head, and he fell." We asked: "Was he the one who said 'Kill me and **Malik**'?" He replied: "No, I did not leave him with anything in my heart. That was **Abd al-Rahman ibn `Atab ibn Asid**, who met me, and we exchanged two blows; he threw me down, and I threw him down. He kept saying: 'Kill me and **Malik**', and they did not know who **Malik** was, so had they known, they would have killed me." This was also narrated by **Ibn Abi Shaybah** in *Al-Musannaf* (15/228).

At this point, **Qaqa'** arrived at the camel and feared that the Mother of the Believers would be harmed, so he began calling for a retreat. **Muhammad ibn Talhah ibn Ubayd Allah** was killed in this battle, and **Qaqa'** took the camel and pulled it out of the battle.

Ibn Abi Shaybah in *Al-Musannaf* (15/285) narrates with a sound chain that **Abd Allah ibn Badil** said to **Aisha**: "O Mother of the Believers, do you know that when **Uthman** was killed, I came to you and asked what you ordered, and you told me to stick with **Ali**?" She remained silent, and he said: "Let's slaughter the camel." So **Ibn Badil** and his brother **Muhammad** took the howdah and placed it before **Ali**. **Ali** then commanded it to be placed in **Abd Allah ibn Badil's** house. This was also mentioned by **al-Hafidh** in *Fath* (13/62).

Here, **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) issued the command: "Do not pursue those fleeing, and do not take prisoners." The people of sedition were enraged and asked: "Is it permissible for us to spill their blood but not take their women and property?" **Ali** responded: "Who among you wants **Aisha** in his share?" They remained silent. Then he called: "Do not kill the wounded, and do not kill those retreating. Whoever shuts his door and lays down his weapon is safe." **Al-Bayhaqi** in *Al-Sunan al-Kubra* (8/182) and **Ibn Abi Shaybah** in *Al-Musannaf* (15/257) and (15/286) with a sound chain.

Al-Shafi'i in *Al-Umm* (4/308) narrates from **Ali ibn al-Husayn ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib** that he entered upon **Marwan ibn al-Hakam**, who said to him: "I have never seen anyone more noble than your father. When we were given leadership on the day of **Al-Jamal**, he called out, 'Do not kill the one fleeing and do not strike a wounded person.'" This was also mentioned by **al-Hafidh** in *Fath* (13/62).

Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) then toured the battlefield as the dead were being buried. When he passed by **Talhah** and saw him dead, he began wiping the dirt from his face, saying: "It is hard for me, O Abu Muhammad, to see you lying under the stars." Then he said: "To Allah, I complain of my grief and my troubles," and he wept for him and for his companions. *Tareekh Dimashq* (25/115) and **Asad al-Ghabah** by **Ibn al-Athir** (3/88-89).

Afterward, **Ali** went to the house of **Abd Allah ibn Badil al-Khuza'i** to visit **Aisha** and check on her. He said to her: "May Allah forgive you." She replied: "And may He forgive you, I only sought reconciliation between the people." This is also found in *Shatharat al-Dhahab* by **Ibn al-Imad al-Hanbali** (1/206), and **Al-Zuhri** in *Al-Maghazi* (p. 154) reported her saying: "I only wanted to prevent conflict between the people, and I never expected there would be fighting. Had I known, I would not have taken that stance." This is the correct version, contrary to what was reported by others who said **Aisha** stayed in **Abd Allah ibn Khallaf al-Khuza'i's** house.

Then **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) arranged for **Aisha** to be sent to **Makkah**, honored and protected. This action by **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) is in fulfillment of the instructions given to him by the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him), as reported by Imam Ahmad in *Al-Musnad* (6/393) with a sound chain from **Abu Rafi** (may Allah be pleased with him) who said: The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said to **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him): "There will be an issue between you and **Aisha**." He asked: "Will I be the one who is wronged, O Messenger of Allah?" The Prophet (peace be upon him) replied: "No, but when that happens, return her to her safe place."

Also, **al-Hakim** in *Al-Mustadrak* (3/119) narrated from **Umm Salamah** (may Allah be pleased with her) who said: "The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) mentioned the departure of some of the Mothers of the Believers, and **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased

with her) laughed. He said: 'Look out, **Humayra**, it should not be you.' Then he turned to **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) and said: 'If you are entrusted with any matter concerning her, treat her kindly.'

The departure of **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her) on the Day of the Camel was considered a mistake made with good intentions, which was reconciliation. She regretted it, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) had informed her that she would be his wife in Paradise, as narrated in the *Mustadrak*, and **Ammar** said: "By Allah, she is the wife of the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) in this world and the Hereafter," as found in the authentic books with this meaning. With these two pieces of evidence and with Allah's description of her in the Qur'an as pure, the tongues of the Rafidah, who slander the companions of the Messenger of Allah, including **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her), are silenced. *Sahih al-Mustadrak from Dalā'il al-Nubuwwah* by Sheikh **Muqbil al-Wadi'i** (p. 417) in the footnote.

She (may Allah be pleased with her) would cry until her veil became wet whenever she read, "And stay in your homes" [Al-Ahzab 33], and when she mentioned the Battle of the Camel, she would say: "I wish I had sat where my companions sat." In a narration from **Ibn Abi Shaiba**, she said: "I wish I were a fresh branch and had not embarked on this journey." *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala* by **Al-Dhahabi** (2/177), *Majma' al-Zawa'id* by **Al-Haythami** (7/238), and **Ibn Abi Shaiba** in *Al-Musannaf* (15/281).

Reason dictates that one must acknowledge the mistake of one of the two fighting factions, both of which had many casualties. It is clear that **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her) was at fault for many reasons and with clear evidence, including her regret for leaving, which is fitting for her nobility and perfection, and this shows that her mistake is one that is forgiven and even rewarded.

Imam al-Zayla'i in *Nayl al-Awtar* mentions that **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her) expressed her regret, as **Ibn Abd al-Barr** narrated in *Al-Istī'āb* from **Ibn Abi Atiq** – **Abd Allah ibn Muhammad ibn Abd al-Rahman ibn Abu Bakr al-Siddiq** – who said: **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her) said to **Ibn Umar**: "O Abu Abd al-Rahman, why did you not stop me from leaving?" He replied: "I saw that a man had overpowered you," referring to **Ibn Zubair**. She then said: "By Allah, if you had stopped me, I would not have gone." **Shaykh al-Albani** (may Allah have mercy on him) in *Al-Sahihah* explains that this

narration has other chains, and **Al-Dhahabi** in *Siyar A'lam al-Nubala* mentions that **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her) considered being buried with the Prophet's wives in **Al-Baqi'**, because she had regretted her actions after the death of the Prophet (peace be upon him), and she said: "Bury me with his wives." **Al-Dhahabi** commented that by "event" she meant her journey to the Battle of the Camel, as she deeply regretted it and repented, as she had only done so with a good intention. She, like **Talhah** and **Al-Zubair** and many other senior companions, had made an effort for good. See *Al-Silsilah al-Sahihah* (1/854-855).

Ibn Taymiyyah in *Minhaj al-Sunnah* (4/316-317, 321-322) and (6/208, 363) states that **Aisha** (may Allah be pleased with her) did not go out for battle; rather, she left with the intention of reconciling the people, believing that her departure would benefit the Muslims. Later, she realized that staying home would have been better, and whenever she mentioned her journey, she would cry until her veil became wet. Similarly, **Talhah** and **Al-Zubair** (may Allah be pleased with them) also regretted what they had entered into from the battle.

Imam al-Qurtubi in his *Tafsir* (8/321-322) explains that no one among the companions should be accused of a definitive error, as they all exerted their efforts for the sake of Allah. This is in line with the many reports from the Prophet (peace be upon him) declaring **Talhah** a martyr walking on Earth, as narrated by **Abu Huraira** in *Sahih Muslim* (4/1880), where the Prophet (peace be upon him) was on Mount **Hiraa** with **Abu Bakr**, **Umar**, **Uthman**, **Ali**, **Talhah**, and **Al-Zubair**. The mountain shook, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) said, "Be still, for there is no one on it except a Prophet, a Siddiq, or a martyr." **Al-Tirmidhi** (5/644), see also *Al-Sunan al-Kubra* by **Al-Nasa'i** (7/113) and *Sunan Ibn Majah* (1/46). Had their participation been a sin, they would not be considered martyrs, as is clear from the Prophet's statements.

Additionally, the Prophet (peace be upon him) declared that the killer of **Al-Zubair** would be in Hell. He said: "I heard the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) say: 'Give glad tidings to the killer of **Ibn Safiyyah** with the Fire,'" as stated earlier. This proves that **Talhah** and **Al-Zubair** were not sinners nor disobedient in their actions; rather, their actions were excusable based on their sincere striving, and they are rewarded for their intentions.

It is wrong to claim that **Talhah** and **Al-Zubair** went out because of ambition for the caliphate or to conspire against others.

Ibn Shabba in his *Akhbar al-Basrah* refutes this claim, stating that there is no narration to suggest that **Aisha** and those with her disputed **Ali's** caliphate, nor did they appoint anyone else for the caliphate. Instead, they objected to **Ali** for delaying the punishment of **Uthman's** killers and for not avenging his death. This was narrated by **Al-Hafidh** in *Al-Fath* (13/60-61).

Ibn Hazm in *Al-Fasl fi al-Milal* (4/238-239) states: "It is absolutely certain that they did not go to **Basrah** to wage war on **Ali** nor to dispute his caliphate, nor to break their allegiance to him. Had they wanted to do that, they would have created another allegiance, which no one denies, and they did not do so. Therefore, they only went to **Basrah** to address the rupture caused by the unjust killing of **Uthman** (may Allah be pleased with him)."

The confrontation between the two factions took place on Thursday, in the middle of Jumada al-Akhirah in the year 36 AH, according to *Tārikh Khalīfah* (p. 184-185), and the fighting occurred after **Dhuhr** and lasted until the sun set. Around the camel, there were those protecting it.

Regarding the number of casualties in the Battle of the Camel, historians have exaggerated, either underestimating or overestimating the numbers according to their biases. The actual number of casualties was very small for the following reasons:

1. The short duration of the battle, as narrated by **Ibn Abi Shaiba** with a sound chain, the fighting began after **Dhuhr**, and by the time the sun set, the battle was over.
2. The defensive nature of the battle, where each side only defended themselves.
3. The reluctance of both sides to fight, as they knew the sanctity of Muslim blood.
4. In comparison to the number of martyrs in the Battle of **Yarmouk** (3,000 martyrs, *Tārikh al-Ṭabarī* 3/402) and the Battle of **Qadisiyyah** (8,500 martyrs, *Tārikh*

al-Ṭabarī 3/564), which lasted for several days, the actual number of casualties in the Battle of the Camel was very low. This is significant considering the intensity of these battles and their crucial importance in the history of nations.

5. **Khalifah ibn Khayyat** in his history (p. 187-190) listed the names of those preserved from the Battle of the Camel, which were around one hundred. Even if the number were 200, it would still suggest that the casualties of the Battle of the Camel were no more than 200. This is the most likely conclusion based on the aforementioned reasons.

This is consistent with the statement of the Prophet (peace be upon him), as narrated by **Al-Bazzar** from **Ibn Abbas** (may Allah be pleased with them) who said: "The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said to his wives: 'I wonder who will be the one with the camel who will be called to it, and the dogs of **Hawab** will bark at her. Many will be killed to her right and left, but she will escape after nearly being killed.'" *Al-Silsila al-Sahihah* (1/853).

The fate of Ibn Saba and his end after these events.

There are various narrations regarding the fate of **Abd Allah ibn Saba**. Some say he was burned with his companions, while others claim he was exiled to **Sabat** in **Al-Mada'in**.

The more likely conclusion, and the one I believe to be correct, is that he was exiled to **Sabat** and died there. The evidence for this is very strong, and here is a brief summary of it:

First: The evidence indicating that **Ali

** (may Allah be pleased with him) burned a group of **Sabe'ah**, but there is no mention of burning **Ibn Saba** along with them:

The report of **Ali ibn Abi Talib** (may Allah be pleased with him) burning the **Sabe'ah** is found in authentic narrations in books of hadith, such as **Sahih al-Bukhari** (4/21, 8/50), **Abu Dawood** (4/520), **Al-Nasa'i** (7/104), **Al-Tirmidhi** (4/59), and **Al-Hakim** in

Al-Mustadrak (3/538-539), which **Shaykh al-Albani** verified in *Sahih Abu Dawood* (3/822).

Imam al-Bukhari narrated from `Ikrimah, the freed slave of **Ibn Abbas** (may Allah be pleased with him), who said: **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) was brought a group of zindiqs (heretics), and he burned them. When this reached **Ibn Abbas**, he said: "If it had been me, I would not have burned them, for the Prophet (peace be upon him) said, 'Do not punish with Allah's punishment.' But I would have killed them, for the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said, 'Whoever changes his religion, kill him.'" (Sahih al-Bukhari, al-Fath 12/279).

Al-Juwayzajani mentioned in *Ahwal al-Rijal* (pp. 37-38), and **Ibn Hajar** in *al-Fath* (12/270) with a good chain: The **Sabe'ah** became extreme in disbelief, claiming that **Ali** was a god, so he burned them with fire to refute them and to bring clarity in the matter, as he said:

"When I saw the matter was something vile,
I kindled my fire and called **Qunbur**."

Ibn Qutaybah in *Ta'wil Mukhtalif al-Hadith* (pp. 78-79), and in *al-Ma'arif* (p. 267), said that **Abd Allah ibn Saba** claimed divinity for **Ali**, so **Ali** burned his companions with fire.

Ibn Hajar in *Lisan al-Mizan* (3/389-390) said: **Abd Allah ibn Saba** is one of the extreme heretics... and regarding his followers, he said: "He had followers known as the **Sabe'ah**, who believed in the divinity of **Ali ibn Abi Talib**, and **Ali** burned them with fire during his caliphate."

Ibn Hazm in *al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Nihal* (4/186) said: The second group of extreme sects that believe in the divinity of someone other than Allah is the followers of **Abd Allah ibn Saba**... He then said: "They spoke to him directly, saying, 'You are He,' and when he asked, 'Who is He?' they replied, 'You are Allah.' He found the matter too great and ordered a fire to be kindled and burned them."

Al-Fakhr al-Razi also confirmed, like other scholars of sects and beliefs, the account of **Ali** burning a group of **Sabe'ah**. See: *A'tiqadat Firqat al-Muslimin wa al-Mushrikin* (p. 57).

Secondly, the evidence that **Ali** burned his followers, and burned **Ibn Saba** with them:

Al-Mamaqani in *Tanqih al-Maqal* (2/184) stated that **Ali** burned **Abd Allah ibn Saba** along with seventy men who claimed divinity and prophethood for him.

Al-Dhahabi in *Mizan al-I'tidal* (2/426) said: "I think **Ali** burned him (referring to **Abd Allah ibn Saba**) with fire." Here he expresses doubt, not being certain about it.

However, **al-Khish** asserted that **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) did indeed burn **Abd Allah ibn Saba** along with his followers. He conveyed several narrations which state that when **Ali** heard of **Ibn Saba's** extremism and his claim of divinity, he summoned him, and **Ibn Saba** confessed. **Ali** asked him to repent, but he refused. He imprisoned him and gave him three days to repent, but when he did not, he burned him with fire. This text can be found in *al-Nash' al-Akbar fi Masa'il al-Imamah* (p. 22).

Thirdly, the evidence that **Ali** burned his followers and then exiled **Ibn Saba** to **Sabat**:

Ibn Taymiyyah in *Minhaj al-Sunnah* (1/23, 30) and (3/459), **Ibn Asakir** in *Tariikh Dimashq* (29/10), and **al-Malti** in *al-Tanbih wa al-Rad 'ala Ahl al-Ahwa' wa al-Bid'* (pp. 29-30) stated that **Ali** burned a group of extreme Shia and exiled some of them, including **Abd Allah ibn Saba**.

Al-Baghdadi in *Al-Farq Bayna al-Firq* (p. 223) said: The **Sabe'ah** manifested their heresy during the time of **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him), and he burned a group of them and exiled **Ibn Saba** to **Sabat al-Mada'in** when **Ibn Abbas** (may Allah be pleased with him) advised against killing him and suggested exiling him to **Mada'in** so that his followers would not be divided, especially since **Ali** was about to return to fight the people of **Sham**.

Al-Shahrastani in *Al-Milal wa al-Nihal* (1/155) said: The **Sabe'ah** are the followers of **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, who said to **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him): "You are You," meaning, "You are the god." **Ali** exiled him to **Mada'in**.

Al-Juwayzajani in *Ahwal al-Rijal* (p. 38) said that among the claims of **Abd Allah ibn Saba** was that the Qur'an is one part of nine parts, and that its knowledge was with **Ali**. **Ali** exiled him after he had threatened to burn him.

The prevailing opinion in this matter is that **Ibn Saba** was not burned but exiled to **Sabat** in **Mada'in**, as many scholars have stated. The evidence that he was exiled and not burned includes what was mentioned earlier, that he was exiled to **Sabat**, and what follows from the fact that **Ibn Saba** appeared after the death of **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him). The researcher need only refer to the statements found in numerous sources to realize that **Ibn Saba** was not burned with his group:

Ibn Saba said to those who came to him with the news of **Ali's** death: "If you had brought us his brain in seventy bags, we would not have believed you. We would know that he has not died, for he does not die until he drives the Arabs with his staff." *Masa'il al-Imamah* by **al-Nash' al-Akbar** (p. 22). Also see the statement in *Al-Farq Bayna al-Firaq* by **al-Baghdadi** (p. 234), *Al-Bada' wa al-Tarikh* by **Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi** (5/129), *al-Maqalat wa al-Firaq* by **al-Qummi** (pp. 20-21), *Al-Bayan wa al-Tabyin* by **al-Jahiz** (3/81), *Al-Majruhin* by **Ibn Hibban** (1/298), *Tathbit Dalail al-Nubuwwah* by **al-Hamadhani** (2/549), and *Firaq al-Shi'ah* by **al-Nubakhti** (p. 43).

Al-Safadi in *Tarjamah ibn Saba* said: **Ibn Saba** was the leader of the **Sabe'ah** sect... He said to **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him), "You are the god." He exiled him to **Mada'in**, and when **Ali** was killed, **Ibn Saba** claimed that he did not die and that he had a divine part, and that **Ibn Muljam** had killed a devil who took the form of **Ali**, and that **Ali** was in the clouds, with thunder as his voice and lightning as his whip, and that he would descend to the earth. *Al-Wafi bil-Wafayat* (17/190).

Al-Karmani in *Al-Firaq al-Islamiyyah* (p. 34) said that when **Ali** (may Allah be pleased with him) was killed, **Abd Allah ibn Saba** claimed that he did not die and that he had a divine part.

Abu al-Hasan al-Ash'ari in *Maqalat al-Islamiyyin* (1/85) listed **Abd Allah ibn Saba** and his followers as part of the extreme sects, claiming that **Ali** did not die and would return to fill the earth with justice as it had been filled with tyranny.

This does not mean that **Ibn Saba** was not killed by others, but based on my limited knowledge and review of many books that discussed this topic, I have not found any mention of such a thing.

However, this does not prevent the fact that all those who participated or helped in the killing of **Uthman** (may Allah be pleased with him) were either killed or punished by Allah, for Allah did not ignore the oppressors but humiliated, disgraced, and avenged them, and none of them escaped. Here are some examples of this:

Khalifah in his *History* (p. 175) with an authentic chain narrated: The first drop of blood that fell from his body—the blood of **Uthman**—was on the Qur'an, and it did not dry up.

Ahmad narrated with an authentic chain from **Amrah bint Artah al-'Adawiyyah** who said: "I went out with **A'ishah** during the year of **Uthman**'s killing to Mecca, and when we passed by Medina, we saw the Qur'an that was killed in his lap. The first drop of blood fell on this verse, {So Allah will suffice you against them, and He is the All-Hearing, All-Knowing}." **Amrah** said: "None of them died soundly." See: *Fadhail al-Sahabah* (1/501) with an authentic chain. It was also narrated in *al-Zuhd* (p. 127-128).

Ibn Asakir in his *History* (39/446-447) narrated from **Ibn Sirin** who said: "I was walking around the Ka'bah when a man said, 'O Allah, forgive me, but I do not think You will forgive me!' I asked him, 'O servant of Allah, why do you say this?' He replied, 'I had made a vow to Allah that if I ever had the chance to slap **Uthman**'s face, I would. When he was killed and placed on his bier, and people came to pray upon him, I entered as though I was praying upon him. I found an opportunity, so I lifted the cloth from his face and slapped it, and my right hand dried up as if it were a stick.'" **Muhammad ibn Sirin** said: "I saw it dry as if it were a stick."

Qatadah narrated that a man from **Bani Sudus** said: "I was one of those who killed **Uthman**. Every one of them was punished except for me." **Qatadah** said: "He did not die until he became blind." *Anasab al-Ashraf* by **al-Baladhuri** (5/102).

Mubarak ibn Fadal narrated that he heard **al-Hasan al-Basri** say: "I do not know anyone who participated in the blood of **Uthman** and did not die a violent death." In another narration: "Allah did not leave the wicked—those who killed **Uthman**—without

punishing them, and they were killed in every land." *Tariikh al-Madina al-Munawwarah* by **Ibn Shabah** (4/1252).

This Jewish figure played a key role in the emergence of the **Rafidah**, and the discussion here is about the religious aspect of **Abd Allah ibn Saba**'s role in this fitnah, leading Muslims away from their faith.

This wicked Jew called to certain Jewish principles and disguised his call under the guise of loving the family of the Prophet (peace be upon him) and advocating for their authority, distancing themselves from their enemies. Those who were easily misled, particularly the Bedouins and those new to Islam, followed him, and they became a religious sect that deviated in belief from Islam, drawing their ideas from the Jewish faith.

This sect was named after its founder and innovator, **Ibn Saba**, so they were called the **Sabe'ah**, and from the **Sabe'ah** the **Rafidah** derived their beliefs and principles, influenced by those Jewish principles disguised as the love of the family of **Ali**.

Thus, it became well-known among scholars that **Abd Allah ibn Saba** was the first to innovate the concept of "refusal" (rejection of authority), and that the rejection (*rafd*) is derived from Judaism.

Shaykh al-Islam **Ibn Taymiyyah** mentioned in *Majmu' al-Fatawa* (28/483): "The scholars have mentioned that the origin of *rafd* came from the heretic **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, who appeared as a Muslim but concealed his Judaism and sought to corrupt Islam, much like Paul (the Christian heretic), who was originally Jewish, corrupted Christianity."

He also said in another part of the *Fatawa* (4/428): "The one who innovated the rejection was a Jew who outwardly displayed Islam hypocritically and secretly sowed seeds of discord among the ignorant, undermining the very foundation of faith. Hence, *rafd* became one of the greatest doors of hypocrisy and heresy."

In another place, he stated (4/435): "The origin of *rafd* lies with the hypocrites and heretics, as it was innovated by **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, who exaggerated in his support for **Ali**, claiming that he was divinely appointed as the Imam, and asserting his infallibility. Because its origin stemmed from hypocrisy, some of the early scholars said: 'Loving

Abu Bakr and **Umar** is faith, and hating them is hypocrisy, loving the family of **Banu Hashim** is faith, and hating them is hypocrisy."

Ibn Abi al-'Iz al-Hanafi in *Sharh al-Tahawiyyah* (p. 578) said: "The origin of *rafd* was created by a hypocrite and heretic, whose goal was to undermine the Islamic faith and to tarnish the reputation of the Messenger (PBUH). When **Abd Allah ibn Saba** pretended to be a devout Muslim, he sought to corrupt the religion of Islam with his cunning, just as Paul did in Christianity. He pretended to follow the practice of enjoining good and forbidding evil, which ultimately led to the turmoil surrounding **Uthman** and his assassination."

Modern studies also confirm that the origin of *rafd* is Jewish, and its founder, **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, was a deceptive Jew who sought to lead Muslims away from the true faith. **Abd Allah al-Qasimī**, in *The Struggle Between Islam and Paganism* (1/11), writes: "As for the one who sowed the seeds of this deviation, **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, he sought to inflict the worst punishment upon him, but he was more cautious than a crow. He fled and left the land. His flight did not relieve the burden of this destructive fitnah nor signify submission to defeat; rather, he fled with these ideas to protect them from burial and death, using them to mislead Muslims and create confusion among the misguided, leaving them as a disgrace and a fire until the Day of Judgment. His claims and innovations spread widely, echoing through the corners of the Islamic realm with a harsh and disturbing sound, and it reached the hearts and ears of many. It was repeated so much that it took root as a solid belief, with blood shed in its name, and enemies of the family of **Ali** were hated in its wake, which later became known as the Shi'ah sect and their beliefs."

Ihsan Ilahi Zahir, after much research into the writings of the Shi'ah, affirmed that their beliefs are based on Jewish foundations through **Abd Allah ibn Saba**. He writes: "As for the faith of the Imamiya and the Twelver sect, it is based on the principles set forth by the cursed Jews through **Abd Allah ibn Saba** of Sana'a, Yemen, who was infamous as 'the black man'." See: *Shi'ah and Sunni* (p. 29).

The above statements from Sunni scholars confirm that the origin of *rafid* came from **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, a Jew, and that the rejectionist (Shi'ah) beliefs are not truly Islamic in nature.

Prominent Shi'ah scholars and historians also acknowledge this. **Al-Kashshi**, a major figure in Shi'ah biographical literature from the 4th century (d. 340 AH), quotes a text from one of their scholars, saying: "Some scholars have mentioned that **Abd Allah ibn Saba** was a Jew who converted to Islam and supported **Ali**. While still a Jew, he believed in the divinity of **Yusha' ibn Nun** (Joshua) and Moses, and when he converted, he did the same for **Ali** after the death of the Prophet (PBUH). He was the first to openly declare the compulsory Imamate of **Ali** and show enmity towards his opponents." See: *Rijal al-Kashshi* (p. 71).

This text is well-known among Shi'ah scholars and has been passed down in many of their primary and authoritative books.

It was also mentioned by **al-Ash'ari al-Qummi** (d. 301 AH) in *Al-Maqalat wa al-Firaq* (p. 20), when he says: "Therefore, those who oppose the Shi'ah argue that the origin of rejection came from Judaism."

It was mentioned by **al-Nubakhti** (d. 310 AH) in *Firaq al-Shi'ah* (p. 44), when he says: "Thus, those who oppose the Shi'ah say that the origin of rejection is derived from the Jews."

It was also mentioned by **al-Mamqani** (d. 1351 AH) in *Tanqih al-Maqal* (2/184).

These prominent historians and researchers of the Shi'ah acknowledge that **Abd Allah ibn Saba** was a Jew and that he adopted the beliefs of **Yusha' ibn Nun** (Joshua) in his Judaism, and similarly for **Ali ibn Abi Talib** in Islam. He was the first to declare the Imamate of **Ali** and disassociate from his opponents, later leading to the term "Shi'ah" being associated with these beliefs.

This acknowledgment by major Shi'ah scholars and historians is the strongest evidence that the origin of *rafid* comes from Judaism and that **Abd Allah ibn Saba** was its innovator in Islam.

Just as Sunni and Shi'ah books demonstrate that the origin of rejection stems from Judaism through **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, so do the works of Western scholars attest to this.

The German Orientalist **Julius Wellhausen** says: "The origin of the **Saba'iyyah** dates back to the time of **Ali** and **Hasan**, and it is attributed to **Abd Allah ibn Saba**. As his name suggests, he was also from Yemen, and in fact, he was from the capital, **Sana'a**. It is also said that he was Jewish, which leads to the conclusion that the **Saba'iyyah** sect has Jewish origins. Muslims often call someone a Jew when, in reality, they are not, but it seems that the Shi'ah sect attributed to **Abd Allah ibn Saba** is closer to a Jewish origin than to Iranian influences." See: *Khawarij wa Shi'ah* (p. 170-171).

The Hungarian Orientalist **Ignaz Goldziher** argues that the Mahdi idea and the belief in **Raj'ah** (return) in Shi'ah doctrine were influenced by Jewish and Christian ideas, and the exaggeration of **Ali's** divinity was formulated by the Jewish **Abd Allah ibn Saba**. He writes: "The Mahdist idea, which led to the theory of Imamate and later to the concept of return (Raj'ah), should all be traced, as we have seen, to Jewish and Christian influences. The extreme deification of **Ali**, initially shaped by **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, occurred in a Semitic environment, untouched by Aryan ideas." See: *Creed and Law in Islam* (p. 205).

Thus, the statements from both Sunni and Shi'ah scholars, as well as Orientalists, all confirm that the origin of rejection comes from Judaism, and that its founder and innovator in Islam was **Abd Allah ibn Saba**, a Jewish figure. Additionally, there are several arguments to support this conclusion:

1. The beliefs of the Shi'ah, which distinguish them from other Islamic sects, such as the belief in **Wilayah** (divine leadership), **Raj'ah** (return), **Badā'** (divine change), **Taqiyyah** (dissimulation), and the exaggerated reverence for their Imams, have no basis in Islam. There is no Qur'anic or prophetic evidence for these beliefs, and the consensus of the Muslim community has always declared them to be false.
2. The distinct beliefs of the Shi'ah have origins in Judaism, and when traced, they reveal either a purely Jewish foundation or influence from Judaism.
3. Prominent scholars from both Sunni and Shi'ah traditions have acknowledged that **Abd Allah ibn Saba** was the first to introduce the idea of **Imamate** for **Ali** and

to announce the notion of **wilayah**, marking the beginning of the deviation known as *rafd*.

Al-Shahrastani mentions in *Al-Milal wa al-Nihal* (1/174) that Ibn Saba' was the first to proclaim the belief in the appointment (nass) of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) as his successor, and from this, the different factions of the extremists branched out. He discusses the Saba'iyya and says: "They were the first to speak of the concept of occultation, return, and the transmigration of the divine part into the Imams after Ali (may Allah be pleased with him)."

Al-Maqrizi mentions in *Al-Khitat* (2/356-357) that Ibn Saba' initiated during the time of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) the claim that the Prophet (peace be upon him) had appointed Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) as his successor, and he introduced the belief in Ali's return to life after death.

When we recognize the weight of these beliefs, which scholars have affirmed were first introduced into Islam by Ibn Saba' the Jew, we realize the significant role of the Jews in the birth of the Rafida (Shi'a).

Fourthly: The statement of Abdullah Ibn Saba' himself that he took the doctrine of the appointment (nass) from the Torah. Al-Baghdadi in *Al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq* (p. 235) narrates from Al-Shu'bi that Ibn Saba' told the people of Kufa: "I found in the Torah that every prophet has a successor, and that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) is the successor of Muhammad (peace be upon him), and that he is the best of the successors, just as Muhammad is the best of the prophets."

If we make a quick comparison between some of the beliefs of the Shi'a and the beliefs of the Saba'iyya, we can see they correspond as outlined below:

Saba'iyya (Jewish beliefs):

1. **Return (Raja')**: The return of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) to this world before the Day of Judgment, a belief taken from the Old Testament - the corrupted version. See: *Isaiah* (4:5).

Shi'a (Rafidi beliefs):

1. In *Awail al-Maqalat fi al-Madhahib al-Mukhtarat* by their scholar Al-Mufid (p. 51): "The Imamiya agree on the necessity of the return of many of the dead to this world before the Day of Judgment, although there is a difference of opinion regarding the exact meaning of return."

Saba'iyya (Jewish beliefs):

2. **Appointment (Wasiya):** The appointment of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) as the successor to the Prophet (peace be upon him), a belief derived from the Old Testament – the corrupted version. See: *Deuteronomy* (34:9).

Shi'a (Rafidi beliefs):

2. In *Al-Kafi* by Al-Kulaini (1/294): "Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) had the right to the appointment (wasiya) that was made for him, the greatest name, the inheritance of knowledge, and the relics of prophetic knowledge."

Saba'iyya (Jewish beliefs):

3. **Divinity:** This entails the belief in Ali's knowledge of the unseen. Refer to *Al-Du'afa wa al-Matrookin* by Ibn Hibban (3/8), *Mizan al-I'tidal* by al-Dhahabi (4/161), and *Al-Maqalat wa al-Firaq* by al-Qummi (p. 21). All of them mention that the Saba'iyya believed that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) had the power to resurrect the dead, and that he was pleased with his divinity, though he burned those who revealed his secret, only to revive them afterward. Also, they claimed that he knew the unseen.

Shi'a (Rafidi beliefs):

3. From *Al-Kafi* (1/258): "When the Imam desires to know, he knows." It is also stated that the Imams know when they will die and they choose their time of death. Their leader, Khomeini, in *Islamic Government* (p. 47), says:

"The Imam has a lofty status, a high degree, and a universal authority. Under his dominion and control, all the atoms of this universe are subjugated."

Saba'iyya (Jewish beliefs):

4. **Ali's knowledge of nine-tenths of the Qur'an, which the Prophet (peace be upon him) concealed.** See: *Abdullah Ibn Saba' wa Atharuh fi Ahdath al-Fitna fi Sadr al-Islam* by Dr. Suleiman al-'Uda (p. 207).

Shi'a (Rafidi beliefs):

4. In *Al-Kafi* (1/239), a narration attributed to Ja'far al-Sadiq says: "We have the Mushaf of Fatima (may Allah be pleased with her)," the narrator asked, "What is the Mushaf of Fatima?" He said: "It is a Mushaf containing three times the length of your Qur'an, but not a single letter of your Qur'an is in it."

Saba'iyya (Jewish beliefs):

5. **Cursing the companions**, especially the first three caliphs, Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman (may Allah be pleased with them). See *Farq al-Shi'a* by al-Nubakhti (p. 43-44) and *Al-Maqalat wa al-Firaq* by al-Qummi (p. 20).

Shi'a (Rafidi beliefs):

5. In *Al-Kafi* (1/32): "When they claim the verse {Indeed, those who believed, then disbelieved, then believed, then disbelieved again, and increased in disbelief, never will their repentance be accepted} – note that this verse merges two different verses from the Qur'an from Surah [An-Nisa/137] and [Aal-Imran/90] – this was revealed about so-and-so, so-and-so, and so-and-so, who believed in the Prophet (peace be upon him) at first, but disbelieved when the allegiance was offered. The so-and-sos refer to Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman, as explained by the commentator of *Al-Kafi*!" According to Al-Mufid in *Awail al-Maqalat fi al-Madhahib al-Mukhtarat* (p.

48): "The Imamiya, Zaydiya, and Khawarij agree that the Nakithin and Qasitine from Basra and Sham are all disbelievers, misguided, and cursed for waging war against the Commander of the Faithful (Ali). They are eternally in Hell."

Saba'iyya (Jewish beliefs):

6. **Bada'**: This refers to the emergence of a new opinion that did not exist before, and it is a belief among the Saba'iyya that implies the appearance of something previously hidden from Allah. See: *Al-Tanbih wa al-Radd* by al-Malati (p. 19) and *Al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq* (p. 36).

Shi'a (Rafidi beliefs):

6. From *Al-Kafi* by al-Kulaini (1/146-148), where he discusses the chapter of *Tawhid* and states the concept of *Bada'*: "If people knew the reward for speaking about Bada', they would never cease discussing it."

These evidences, in addition to the quotes we have previously shared from scholars of both Sunni and Shi'a traditions, along with the testimonies of some Orientalists, confirm Abdullah Ibn Saba's role in the formation of the Rafida and prove that the origin of Rafidism is taken from Judaism.

In conclusion, we have come to the end of the series on Abdullah Ibn Saba'. Until we meet again, I entrust you to Allah. Peace and blessings be upon you, and praise be to Allah for His grace and guidance.

And may Allah guide our loved ones, friends and family, and all of the Muslims in a whole; heal us and our friends and loved ones. Ameen.

- The One in Need of Allah

In the Name of Allah, the Most Gracious, the Most Merciful

The Truthful Report on the Reality of Abdullah bin Saba

All praise is due to Allah, and may peace and blessings be upon the Messenger of Allah.
After that:

My dear brothers in Allah, in response to the request of a dear brother, I am republishing what I wrote nearly a year ago in a series of articles on Abdullah bin Saba and the division he caused within the Muslim Ummah. I gladly fulfill this request and would like to draw the attention of esteemed brothers to a selection of books that I recommend acquiring for their benefit. These include:

- Abdullah bin Saba and His Influence on the Events of the Fitnah in Early Islam by Dr. Suleiman bin Hamad Al-Ouda.
- Verifying the Positions of the Companions in the Fitnah Based on the Narrations of Imam Al-Tabari and the Hadith Scholars by Dr. Muhammad Al-Mahzoun.
- Abdullah bin Saba: Reality, Not Fiction by Dr. Saadi Mahdi Al-Hashimi.
- Exerting Effort in Proving the Resemblance of the Rafidah to the Jews by Abdullah Al-Jumaili.
- Jewish Racism and Its Effects on Islamic Society and the Stance Towards It by Dr. Ahmad bin Abdullah bin Ibrahim Al-Zughaybi.

These books are among the best in discussing Abdullah bin Saba in varying levels of detail. I have also done my utmost to research and discuss aspects that the scholars may not have

covered, so that the benefit is maximized. I ask Allah to make this effort sincere for His sake and to guide through it those who have strayed from the straight path.

Now, to the topic...

Among the greatest sects that have been, and continue to be, a calamity and an affliction upon Muslims throughout history and in all stages of their lives is the Shia sect in its various branches and differing beliefs. It began with the Sabaiyyah, the followers of Abdullah bin Saba, the Jew who played a central role in fueling the fire of fitnah and sowing discord among Muslims. His followers went as far as to deify Ali (may Allah be pleased with him).

Before delving into the topic, a prelude is necessary to clarify the matter and explain its essence.

The Origin and Background of Ibn Saba

Scholars of sects and history have differed regarding the identity of Abdullah bin Saba, including his place of origin and tribe. Al-Qalqashandi states in *Qala'id al-Juman* (p. 39) that Ya'rub bin Qahtan had a son named Yashjub, and Yashjub had a son named Saba. The name Saba belonged to Abd Shams, who ruled Yemen after his father, engaged extensively in raids and captivity, and was thus called "Saba," a name that became exclusive to him. Over time, the name was applied to his descendants, who are mentioned in the Qur'an.

Historical sources do not provide a clear account of the origin of the Sabaeans, to whom Abdullah bin Saba is attributed. It is likely that they were originally nomadic tribes roaming the north before migrating south to Yemen around 800 BCE, a movement common among Arabs, possibly due to pressure from the Assyrians. Eventually, they settled in Yemen and began expanding. See: *Lectures on the History of the Arabs* by Dr. Saleh Al-Ali (1/21).

Some attribute Ibn Saba to the tribe of Himyar, a tribe descending from Himyar bin Al-Ghawth bin Saad bin Awf bin Malik bin Zayd bin Sadd bin Himyar bin Saba Al-Asghar bin Luhay'ah bin Himyar bin Saba bin Yashjub, also known as Himyar Al-Akbar. Himyar Al-Ghawth was known as Himyar Al-Adna. Their homeland was in Yemen, in a place called Himyar, west of Sana'a. See: *Mu'jam al-Buldan* by Yaqut al-Hamawi (2/306).

Among those who held this view is Ibn Hazm in *Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Ahwa'* (5/46), where he states:

"The second type of extremist sects believes in the divinity of someone other than Allah, and the first of them were a group from among the followers of Abdullah bin Saba Al-Himyarī."

However, Al-Baladhuri in *Ansab al-Ashraf* (5/240), Al-Ash'ari Al-Qummi in *Maqalat wa al-Firaq* (p. 20), and Al-Farazdaq in his *Diwan* (pp. 242-243) attribute Ibn Saba to the Hamdani tribe. Hamdan is a branch of Kahlan from Qahtan, descending from Hamdan bin Malik bin Zayd bin Awsalah bin Rabee'ah bin Al-Khiyar bin Malik bin Zayd bin Kahlan. Their territory was in eastern Yemen. See: *Mu'jam Qaba'il al-Arab* by Ridha Kahala (3/1225).

According to Al-Baladhuri, his name was Abdullah bin Saba bin Wahb Al-Hamdani. Al-Ash'ari Al-Qummi refers to him as Abdullah bin Saba bin Wahb Al-Rasbi Al-Hamdani.

Al-Farazdaq mentions Ibn Saba's attribution to Hamdan in his poem satirizing the noblemen of Iraq and those who joined the rebellion of Ibn al-Ash'ath in the Battle of Dayr al-Jamajim in 82 AH, describing them as Sabaiyyah:

"As if at Dayr al-Jamajim among them... Were harvested crops or fallen palm trunks."

"A woman of Hamdan, of Sabaiyyah roots... Resists with her eyes what she detests."

Abdul-Qahir al-Baghdadi, in *Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq* (p. 235), claims that Ibn Saba was from Al-Hira, stating:

"Abdullah bin Al-Sawda used to support the Sabaiyyah in their views, and he was originally from the Jews of Al-Hira, but he pretended to be Muslim."

Ibn Kathir, in *Al-Bidayah wa al-Nihayah* (7/190), states that Ibn Saba was of Roman origin:

"His origin was Roman. He pretended to be Muslim and introduced doctrinal and practical innovations—may Allah curse him."

However, Al-Tabari and Ibn Asakir narrate that Ibn Saba was from Yemen. Al-Tabari writes in his *History* (4/340):

"Abdullah bin Saba was a Jew from Sana'a."

Ibn Asakir, in *Tarikh Dimashq* (29/3), states:

"Abdullah bin Saba, to whom the Sabaiyyah sect of extremist Rafidah is attributed, was originally from Yemen and was a Jew."

The opinion I lean towards and consider most probable is that Ibn Saba was from Yemen. This view aligns with most scholarly opinions regarding his place of origin. If we examine the previous views, we find no contradiction between this opinion and the first view that attributes him to the Himyar tribe, or the second view that attributes him to the Hamdani tribe, since both tribes are from Yemen.

Only Al-Baghdadi, who attributes him to Al-Hira, and Ibn Kathir, who claims he was Roman, differ on this matter.

However, Al-Baghdadi appears to have confused Ibn Al-Sawda with Ibn Saba, mistakenly thinking they were two different persons. He writes:

"Al-Sha'bi mentioned that Abdullah bin Al-Sawda supported the Sabaiyyah in their beliefs..."

He then discusses Ibn Al-Sawda's statements about Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) before stating:

"When Ali feared that killing him and Ibn Saba would cause unrest, as Ibn Abbas feared, he exiled them to Al-Mada'in, where they misled the ignorant."

(*Al-Farq bayn al-Firaq*, p. 235).

What Al-Baghdadi mentioned was about Abdullah bin Al-Sawdaa being from Al-Hira, and he did not mention anything about Ibn Saba. Therefore, we cannot assert that Al-Baghdadi attributed Ibn Saba, who is well known in books on sects and is considered the founder of the Sabaiyyah sect, to Al-Hira. It is possible that he was referring to someone else entirely. Evidence that he did not mean Ibn Saba is his statement regarding Abdullah bin Al-Sawdaa: "He used to support the Sabaiyyah in their views." This indicates that he was not the founder of the Sabaiyyah.

As for Ibn Kathir, I do not know of any historian or scholar of sects who agreed with his attribution of Ibn Saba to the Romans (Al-Rum). In some printed editions of *Al-Bidaya wa Al-Nihaya*, the word "Dhimmi" appears instead of "Roman." See the second edition (7/173) from Maktabat Al-Ma'arif. It is likely that the original word was "Dhimmi" but was miscopied by scribes. The fact that Ibn Saba was a Dhimmi does not contradict the widespread scholarly consensus that he was Jewish. Thus, Ibn Kathir's statement does not contradict what is widely reported in historical and sectarian books regarding Ibn Saba's origin being from Yemen.

Therefore, the most likely conclusion is that Ibn Saba was from Yemen, but we cannot definitively attribute him to a specific tribe due to a lack of evidence. And Allah knows best.

Dispute Over Ibn Saba's Paternal Lineage

Historians and scholars of sects have also disagreed about Ibn Saba's father's name. Some attributed his father's name to "Wahb," as mentioned by Al-Baladhuri in *Ansab Al-Ashraf* (5/240), Al-Ash'ari Al-Qummi in *Maqalat wa Al-Firaq* (p. 20), Al-Dhahabi in *Al-Mushtabih fi Asma' Al-Rijal* (1/346), and Al-Maqrizi in *Al-Khitat* (2/356).

Others called him "Abdullah bin Wahb Al-Rasbi," as stated by Al-Ash'ari Al-Qummi in *Maqalat* (p. 20). However, this likely resulted from confusion between Abdullah bin Saba and Abdullah bin Wahb Al-Rasbi, the leader of the Kharijites. The difference between the two figures is clear to any scholar:

- Ibn Saba's origins and fate remain shrouded in mystery.
- Ibn Wahb Al-Rasbi, however, is well-documented:
 - He was the leader of the Kharijites who rebelled against Ali (may Allah be pleased with him). (*Sharh Sahih Muslim* by Al-Nawawi, 7/172).
 - He was killed in the Battle of Nahrawan. (*Al-Ibar fi Khabar Man Ghabar* by Al-Dhahabi, 1/44).
- His life was far more known compared to Ibn Saba.
- He participated in the conquests of Iraq and initially supported Ali before later rebelling against him. (*Araa' Al-Khawarij* by Ammar Al-Talbi, p. 94).

A further confirmation of the distinction between the two names is Al-Sam'ani's statement in Al-Ansab (7/24):

“Abdullah bin Wahb Al-Sabai was the leader of the Kharijites, and I believe this Ibn Wahb is associated with Abdullah bin Saba.”

Some attributed Ibn Saba's father to “Harb,” as did Al-Jahiz in Al-Bayan wa Al-Tabyin (3/81). He cites a narration from Zahr bin Qays, who said:

“I arrived in Al-Mada'in after Ali ibn Abi Talib (may Allah honor his face) was struck, and I met Ibn Al-Sawdaa, who was the son of Harb...”

However, most scholars attribute Ibn Saba to “Saba” as his father's name, referring to him as “Abdullah bin Saba.” Among them:

- Al-Baladhuri (Ansab Al-Ashraf, 3/382)
- Ibn Qutaybah (Al-Ma'arif, p. 622)
- Al-Tabari (Tarikh Al-Tabari, 4/340)
- Abu Al-Hasan Al-Ash'ari (Maqalat Al-Islamiyyin, 1/86)
- Al-Shahrastani (Al-Milal wa Al-Nihal, 1/174)
- Al-Dhahabi (Al-Mizan, 2/426)
- Ibn Hajar (Lisan Al-Mizan, 3/290)
- Ibn Abd Rabbih (Al-'Iqd Al-Farid, 2/405)
- Shaykh Al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (Majmu' Al-Fatawa, 28/483)
- Ibn Hibban (Al-Majruhin, 2/253)
- Al-Jawzajani (Ahwal Al-Rijal, p. 38)
- Al-Maqdisi (Al-Bada' wa Al-Tarikh, 5/129)
- Al-Khwarizmi (Mafatih Al-'Ulum, p. 22)
- Ibn Hazm (Al-Fasl fi Al-Milal wa Al-Nihal, 4/186)
- Al-Asfarayini (Al-Tabsirah fi Al-Din, p. 108)
- Ibn Asakir (Tarikh Dimashq, 29/3)
- Al-Sam'ani (Al-Ansab, 7/24)
- Ibn Al-Athir (Al-Lubab, 2/98)

Additionally, some Shia sources also confirm that Ibn Saba existed and was attributed to Saba:

- Al-Nashi' Al-Akbar (Masa'il Al-Imamah, pp. 22-23)
- Al-Ash'ari Al-Qummi (Maqalat wa Al-Firaq, p. 20)
- Al-Nawbakhti (Firaq Al-Shi'ah, p. 22)

Ibn Saba's maternal lineage traces back to an Ethiopian mother, as mentioned by Al-Tabari in Tarikh Al-Tabari (4/326-327) and Ibn Habib in Al-Muhabbar (p. 308). For this reason, he was often referred to as "Ibn Al-Sawdaa" (Son of the Black Woman).

For example:

- Al-Bayan wa Al-Tabyin (3/81): "...Then Ibn Al-Sawdaa met me."
- Tarikh Al-Tabari (4/326): "Ibn Al-Sawdaa stayed with Hakim bin Jabala in Basra."
- Tarikh Al-Islam by Al-Dhahabi (2/122): "When Ibn Al-Sawdaa went to Egypt."

These references all refer to Abdullah bin Saba, which is why Al-Maqrizi stated in Al-Khitat (2/356):

"Abdullah bin Wahb bin Saba, known as Ibn Al-Sawdaa."

Likewise, Ibn Asakir recorded in Tarikh Dimashq (29/8):

Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) said:

"Who will rid me of this stubborn black man who lies about Allah and His Messenger?"—meaning Ibn Al-Sawdaa.

There are many similar accounts confirming this identity.

The Confusion Between Ibn Saba and Ibn Al-Sawdaa

Just as there was confusion regarding Ibn Saba's paternal lineage, some scholars who were unaware of his maternal lineage mistakenly believed that Ibn Saba and Ibn Al-Sawdaa were two different people.

For example:

- Al-'Iqd Al-Farid by Ibn Abd Rabbih (2/241) states:

"Among them was Abdullah bin Saba, whom [Ali] exiled to Sabat, and Abdullah bin Al-Sawdaa, whom he exiled to Al-Khazir."

- Al-Tabsirah by Al-Asfarayini (p. 108) says:

“Ibn Al-Sawdaa agreed with Abdullah bin Saba in his views after the death of Ali.”

- Al-Farq Bayn Al-Firaq by Al-Baghdadi (p. 235) states:

“When Ali feared that killing Ibn Al-Sawdaa and Ibn Saba would cause strife, he exiled them to Al-Mada’in.”

Conclusion on Identity

By analyzing these narrations, the most probable conclusion is:

- Ibn Saba is NOT Abdullah bin Wahb Al-Rasbi.
- Ibn Saba and Ibn Al-Sawdaa are the same person.

And Allah knows best.

Ibn Saba's Physical Appearance

Ibn Saba was described as having black skin, which supports the view that his mother was Ethiopian.

Ibn Asakir in Tarikh Dimashq (29/7-8) narrates from Ammar Al-Dahni, who said:

“I heard Abu Al-Tufayl say: I saw Al-Musayyib bin Najabah grab Ibn Al-Sawdaa by his collar while Ali was on the pulpit.”

Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) asked:

“What is the matter with him?”

Al-Musayyib replied:

“He lies about Allah and His Messenger.”

Similarly, in a narration from Zayd bin Wahb, Ali said:

“What do I have to do with this stubborn black man?”

From another narration by Salamah, Abu Al-Za'raa reports:

“I heard Ali say: What do I have to do with this stubborn black man?”

Zayd also narrates that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) said:

“What do I have to do with this stubborn black man?”—meaning Abdullah bin Saba, who used to insult Abu Bakr and Umar.

Was Ibn Saba Jewish?

Was Ibn Saba's Jewish origin a settled matter, or is there a scholarly debate?

The orientalist Hodgson suggests that Ibn Saba was most likely not Jewish. He supports the view of Italian orientalist Levi Della Vida, who argues that Ibn Saba's reported Arab tribal affiliation with the Himyarite tribe of Hamdan (as stated by Al-Baladhuri) contradicts the claim that he was Jewish.

However, Dr. Abdel Rahman Badawi in *Madhahib Al-Islamiyyin* (2/30) refutes this argument, stating:

"This is an unjustified conclusion. There is no contradiction between being Jewish and belonging to an Arab tribe."

Ibn Qutaybah (may Allah have mercy on him) pointed out that some Arab tribes practiced Judaism. In *Al-Ma'arif* (p. 266), he states:

"Judaism existed among Himyar, Banu Kinana, Banu Al-Harith bin Ka'b, and Kindah."

Furthermore, Dr. Jawad Ali in *Tarikh Al-Arab Qabla Al-Islam* (6/26) noted:

"The dominant trend among Yemeni Jews is that most of them were of Arab descent."

Even if Ibn Saba were definitively from Hamdan, it does not necessarily mean that he was not Jewish.

- Was his Hamdan lineage by blood or simply by allegiance (wala')?
- Even if his origins were uncertain, it does not negate his Jewish influence.

Some orientalists question his Jewish origins based on the argument that his beliefs about the Mahdi were influenced by Christian eschatology rather than Jewish teachings. However, this argument weakens upon further examination.

Jewish beliefs in Yemen during that period were a mix of Christianity and Mosaic traditions.

- Their Judaism was superficial and heavily influenced by Christianity.
- Ibn Saba's Jewish background may have been similar to the Falasha Jews (Ethiopian Jews), whose beliefs were deeply affected by Ethiopian Christianity.

This is further elaborated in Dr. Abdel Rahman Badawi's *Madhahib Al-Islamiyyin* (2/28).

Ibn Saba's Jewish origin was never a subject of dispute in historical narrations, books on sects, or the opinions of early scholars such as Al-Tabari, Ibn Asakir, Ibn Al-Athir, Al-Baghdadi, Ibn Hazm, and Shaykh Al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (may Allah have mercy on them).

The Reason for the Dispute Regarding Ibn Saba's Identity

It is not surprising that scholars differ greatly in determining the identity and lineage of Ibn Saba.

Ibn Saba surrounded himself with an aura of mystery and complete secrecy, even among his contemporaries. His real name and homeland remain unknown because he entered Islam only to conspire against it, weave plots, and create turmoil among Muslims.

This is why, when Abdullah bin Aamir, the governor of Basra under Uthman bin Affan (may Allah be pleased with him), questioned him, Ibn Saba did not reveal his name or his father's name.

Instead, he replied:

"I am a man from the People of the Book who desires Islam and seeks refuge in your land."

(Tarikh Al-Tabari 4/326-327)

In my opinion, this complete secrecy was a major reason for historians and researchers differing on Ibn Saba's lineage.

It is not unlikely that Ibn Saba used multiple names mentioned by historians—or even invented false identities—to cover up the crimes and conspiracies he committed against the Islamic state.

The Early Life of Ibn Saba

Based on the previous information, we can outline some key points regarding Ibn Saba's background and upbringing:

1. Ibn Saba grew up in Yemen.
 - Historical reports strongly suggest that his origins were Yemeni, though it is uncertain whether he belonged to the Himyar or Hamdan tribe.
 - We cannot definitively determine which tribe he was from.
2. The presence of Jews in Yemen
 - The exact time of Jewish settlement in Yemen is uncertain, but some scholars suggest it dates back to 70 CE.
 - This was when Jews fled Palestine after the Roman Emperor Titus destroyed Jerusalem and its temple (Bayt Al-Maqdis).

- Many Jews dispersed across different lands and some sought refuge in Yemen, finding it a safe haven.
- Later, when the Abyssinians conquered Yemen in 525 CE, Christianity began spreading there.

(Yemen Throughout History by Ahmed Hussein, p. 158-159)

3. Jewish-Christian Religious Influence in Yemen

- Over time, Jewish beliefs in Yemen merged with Christian teachings.
- This led to a superficial and diluted form of Judaism.

(Madhahib Al-Islamiyyin by Abdel Rahman Badawi, 2/28)

4. The survival of Judaism in Yemen

- Even though Abyssinian rule weakened Judaism in Yemen, Judaism was never completely eradicated.
- It remained a distinct presence and did not entirely vanish.

(Tarikh Al-Arab Qabla Al-Islam by Jawad Ali, 6/34)

Through these insights, we can better understand the environment that shaped Ibn Saba's ideas—particularly his beliefs in “Raj’ah” (return of the dead) and “Wasiyyah” (divine succession).

Ibn Saba once said:

“How strange that people believe in the return of Jesus but deny the return of Muhammad! Didn't Allah say:

‘Surely, the One who ordained the Quran for you will return you to a place of return’ (Quran 28:85)?

Muhammad is more deserving of returning than Jesus! There were a thousand prophets, each with a successor—

Ali is the successor of Muhammad. And just as Muhammad is the last of the prophets, Ali is the last of the successors!”

(Tarikh Al-Tabari 4/340)

Despite these findings, the information available remains scarce and inconclusive.

- The sources at hand provide very little insight into Ibn Saba's upbringing.
- No details exist about his youth or life before his emergence in history.

- Given the lack of reliable information, it is best to remain silent on matters unknown to early historians—until new historical evidence emerges to shed light on this mystery.
-

Ibn Saba's Emergence Among Muslims

According to Tarikh Al-Tabari (4/340), Al-Kamil by Ibn Al-Athir (3/77), Al-Bidayah wa Al-Nihayah by Ibn Kathir (7/167), and Tarikh Dimashq by Ibn Asakir (29/7-8), among other historical sources:

- Abdullah bin Saba was a Jew from Sana'a, Yemen.
- He converted to Islam during the caliphate of Uthman bin Affan (may Allah be pleased with him).
- He then traveled across the Muslim lands, seeking to mislead the people.
- His journey began in Hijaz, then he moved to Basra, Kufa, and Syria.
- However, he failed to gain followers in these regions.
- Eventually, he settled in Egypt, where he found success in spreading his beliefs.
- There, he introduced the doctrines of "Wasiyyah" (Ali's divine succession) and "Raj'ah" (the return of the dead).
- His ideas were embraced by a group of people who became his supporters.

However, the exact time and place of Ibn Saba's first public appearance among Muslims remain unclear.

In Al-Bidaya wa Al-Nihaya by Ibn Kathir (7/183), within the events of the year 34 AH, it is mentioned that Abdullah bin Saba was the reason behind the factions' rebellion against Uthman.

Later, in the events of 35 AH (Al-Bidaya wa Al-Nihaya 7/190), Ibn Kathir places Ibn Saba among the factions that came from Egypt, calling for the removal of Uthman.

However, Al-Tabari (4/331) and Ibn Al-Athir (3/147) mention Ibn Saba among the Muslims even before 34 AH, specifically in Kufa.

They narrate that Yazid bin Qais, the man who entered the mosque in Kufa intending to remove Uthman's governor, Sa'id bin Al-As, was supported by those whom Ibn Al-Sawda' (Ibn Saba) had been corresponding with.

This suggests that Ibn Saba appeared before this date, establishing a network of supporters who later joined Yazid bin Qais.

This is further confirmed in Al-Tabari (4/326) and Ibn Al-Athir (3/144), which state that in 33 AH, three years after Abdullah bin Aamir became the governor of Basra, Ibn Saba arrived and settled with Hakim bin Jabala.

This led to the famous confrontation between Ibn Aamir and Ibn Al-Sawda', which was mentioned earlier.

Further Tracing Ibn Saba's Appearance Among Muslims

Continuing the investigation, we find mentions of Ibn Saba even earlier.

- In Al-Tabari (4/283) and Ibn Al-Athir (3/114), under the events of 30 AH, it is mentioned that Ibn Al-Sawda' traveled to Syria and met Abu Dhar Al-Ghifari, influencing him against Mu'awiya.

- (A detailed examination of Ibn Saba's impact on Abu Dhar will be addressed later.)

Ibn Saba in Hijaz

Since Ibn Saba appeared in Hijaz before his emergence in Basra and Syria, his first appearance must have been before 30 AH—as he was already in Syria by that year.

However, historical sources provide very little detail about his presence in Hijaz.

This suggests that he did not remain there for long but rather passed through Hijaz as part of his wider mission.

It seems that he failed to achieve anything significant in Hijaz, so he moved on to Basra.

(Al-Tabari, 4/340-341)

Ibn Saba in Basra

In Basra, Ibn Saba settled with Hakim bin Jabala Al-Abdi.

Al-Tabari (4/326) narrates:

“Three years after Ibn Aamir's appointment as governor of Basra, he learned that a man from Abdul Qais had settled with Hakim bin Jabala.

- Hakim was known as a thief who would linger behind armies returning from campaigns.

- He would attack the people of Persia, disguise himself, cause destruction, take what he wished, and then return.

- Both Muslims and non-Muslims complained about him to Uthman.

Uthman then wrote to Ibn Aamir:

‘Detain him and those like him. Do not allow them to leave Basra until you confirm their righteousness.’

So Ibn Aamir detained Hakim bin Jabala.

When Ibn Al-Sawda’ arrived in Basra, he stayed with Hakim bin Jabala and gathered a small group.

- He introduced his ideas gradually without making his full agenda clear.
- Yet, his followers accepted him and held him in high regard.

According to Al-Tabari, Ibn Saba found willing listeners in Basra, though he did not disclose everything.

However, his plot was interrupted when Basra’s governor, Ibn Aamir, received news of Ibn Saba’s activities.

Ibn Aamir summoned him and asked:

“Who are you?”

Ibn Saba replied:

“I am a man from the People of the Book who desires Islam and seeks refuge in your land.”

Ibn Aamir responded:

“That is not what I have heard! Leave my land!”

Thus, Ibn Saba was expelled from Basra and moved to Kufa.

(Al-Tabari, 4/326-327)

Ibn Saba in Kufa

It seems that Ibn Saba did not stay long in Kufa before being expelled.

As Al-Tabari (4/327) narrates:

“He left Basra and went to Kufa, but he was expelled from there as well. He then settled in Egypt, where he maintained correspondence with his followers.”

Even though he was removed from Kufa in 33 AH, his influence did not end.

He continued to communicate with his supporters in Kufa, guiding them through letters.

(Al-Tabari, 4/327; Ibn Al-Athir, 3/144)

Ibn Saba in Syria

Regarding Ibn Saba's presence in Syria, Al-Tabari presents two different narratives, each offering a unique perspective.

The first account states that in 30 AH, Ibn Saba met Abu Dhar in Syria and incited him against Mu'awiya.

Ibn Saba reportedly told Abu Dhar:

"Isn't it strange that Mu'awiya claims that wealth belongs to Allah? As if he wants to keep it for himself and deprive the Muslims!"

After this conversation, Abu Dhar confronted Mu'awiya about his governance.

(Al-Tabari, 4/283)

While the first text implies that Ibn Saba had no significant role in al-Sham and that its people expelled him until he arrived in Egypt, as stated: "He was unable to achieve what he wanted with any of the people of al-Sham." (Al-Tabari, 4/340).

We can reconcile these accounts by considering that Ibn Saba entered al-Sham twice: first in 30 AH, when he met Abu Dharr, and second in 33 AH, after being expelled from Kufa. In this second attempt, he failed to gain any influence, which corresponds to the second account in Al-Tabari.

Additionally, it is possible that Ibn Saba met Abu Dharr in 30 AH, but did not influence him or incite him against Mu'awiyah. The following points support this view:

1. Abu Dharr (RA) did not confront Mu'awiyah (RA) alone with these views; rather, he opposed all wealthy individuals who accumulated wealth, interpreting Allah's statement: "And those who hoard gold and silver..." (At-Tawbah: 34).
2. When Mu'awiyah complained to Uthman (RA) about Abu Dharr, he made no mention of Ibn Saba's influence, saying only: "Abu Dharr has become unbearable for me, and this is what happened..." (Al-Tabari, 4/283).
3. Ibn Kathir, in *Al-Bidaya wa'l-Nihaya* (7/170, 180), mentioned the disagreement between Abu Dharr and Mu'awiyah multiple times without referencing Ibn Saba, instead citing Abu Dharr's interpretation of the verse.
4. In *Sahih al-Bukhari* (2/111), a hadith narrates the origin of the dispute between Abu Dharr and Mu'awiyah with no mention of Ibn Saba. Zayd ibn Wahb said: "I passed by al-Rabadha and found Abu Dharr (RA). I asked him, 'What brought you here?' He said, 'I was in al-Sham and had a disagreement with Mu'awiyah regarding the verse:

“And those who hoard gold and silver and do not spend it in Allah’s cause...” Mu’awiyah said it referred to the People of the Book, but I said it applied to both them and us. We had a dispute over it, and he wrote to Uthman (RA) complaining about me. Uthman then ordered me to return to Madinah. When I arrived, people gathered around me as if they had never seen me before. I mentioned this to Uthman, and he said, ‘If you wish, you may move nearby.’ So that is what brought me to this place.”

5. The most famous biographical works on the Sahabah, such as *Al-Isti’ab* by Ibn Abdul Barr (1/214), *Asad al-Ghabah* by Ibn al-Athir (1/357), and *Al-Isabah* by Ibn Hajar (4/62), mention the discussion between Abu Dharr and Mu’awiyah and his subsequent settlement in al-Rabadha but make no reference to Ibn Saba’s influence.

6. Lastly, there remains skepticism about this incident. How could a cunning Jew, even if he concealed himself as a Muslim, influence a great Companion who enjoyed the honor of the Prophet’s company?

Ibn Saba’s Emergence in Egypt

Based on the historical accounts above, Ibn Saba appeared in Egypt after being expelled from Kufa. Since he was in Basra in 33 AH, expelled to Kufa, and then moved to Egypt, his presence in Egypt likely began in 34 AH. This is confirmed by Ibn Kathir in *Al-Bidaya wa’l-Nihaya* (7/284), who places Ibn Saba’s arrival in Egypt in 34 AH. Al-Suyuti also follows this timeline in *Husn al-Muhadara* (2/164).

Dear brothers in faith, continuing from our previous discussions, we will examine, in the next two sessions, several key topics related to Ibn Saba. These include references to Ibn Saba and the Sabaiyyah sect in early sources—both Sunni and Shia, classical and contemporary. If the Sabaiyyah are mentioned, it serves as evidence of their connection to Ibn Saba, which in turn confirms his historical existence. Additionally, we will respond to attempts to deny his existence and the deeds attributed to him. We will follow a chronological approach to these events:

First: Who Confirmed the Existence of Abdullah Ibn Saba?

A – Ibn Saba in Sunni Sources

1. The poet A’sha Hamdan (d. 84 AH) mentioned the Sabaiyyah in his *Diwan* (p. 148) and in *Tarikh al-Tabari* (6/83) while satirizing al-Mukhtar ibn Abi Ubayd al-Thaqafi and his supporters in Kufa. After fleeing with the noble tribes of Kufa to Basra, he wrote:

“I bear witness against you that you are Sabaiyyah, and I know you well, O troops of disbelief.”

2. The term Sabaiyyah appears in *Kitab al-Irja’* by al-Hasan ibn Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyah (d. 95 AH). This was referenced in Dr. Safar al-Hawali’s work *Dhahirat al-Irja’ fi’l-Fikr al-Islami* (1/345–361), where he discussed the meaning of “Irja’” attributed to al-Hasan. The book quotes:

“Among the disputes of this Sabaiyyah sect that we encountered, they claim to have received divine guidance that others missed.”

(Narrated by Ibn Abi Umar al-Adani in Kitab al-Iman, p. 249).

3. A narration from al-Sha'bi (d. 103 AH), recorded by Ibn Asakir in Tarikh Dimashq (29/7), states:

“The first liar was Abdullah Ibn Saba.”

4. The poet al-Farazdaq (d. 116 AH) referred to the Sabaiyyah in his Diwan (p. 242–243) while satirizing the nobles of Iraq and those who joined Abdul Rahman ibn al-Ash'ath's rebellion in the Battle of Dayr al-Jamajim. He wrote:

“It was as if Dayr al-Jamajim was filled with reaped harvests or fallen palm trunks,

Recognizable by their Himyarite and Sabaiyyah lineage,

You saw him among the slain, covered in dust and blood.”

This indicates that the Sabaiyyah were recognized as a distinct political faction with a specific ideological stance linked to the Jewish figure Ibn Saba.

5. Imam Al-Tabari, in his Tafsir (3/119), quoted Qatadah ibn Di'ama al-Sadusi al-Basri (d. 117 AH) on the verse:

“As for those in whose hearts is deviation, they follow that which is ambiguous...” (Aal Imran: 7).

Qatadah commented: “If they are not the Kharijites and Sabaiyyah, then I do not know who they are.”

6. In Tabaqat al-Kubra by Ibn Sa'd (d. 230 AH), the Sabaiyyah and their leader's ideas are mentioned, though Ibn Saba is not named explicitly (Tabaqat, 3/39).

7. Ibn Habib al-Baghdadi (d. 245 AH) referenced Ibn Saba in Al-Muhabbar (p. 308), classifying him as one of the descendants of Ethiopian women.

8. Abu Asim Khushaysh ibn Asram (d. 253 AH) narrated the story of Ali (RA) burning Ibn Saba's followers in Kitab al-Istiqama (see: Minhaj al-Sunnah by Ibn Taymiyyah, 1/7).

9. Al-Jahiz (d. 255 AH) referenced Ibn Saba in Al-Bayan wa't-Tabyin (3/81).

10. Imam Al-Bukhari (d. 256 AH) mentioned in Kitab Istitabat al-Murtaddin of Sahih al-Bukhari (8/50) that Ali (RA) burned some apostates. The narration of Ikrimah states:

“Ali brought some heretics and burned them. When Ibn Abbas heard, he said: ‘If I were in his place, I would not have burned them, because the Prophet (SAW) said: ‘Do not punish with Allah's punishment.’ However, I would have executed them because the Prophet (SAW) said: ‘Whoever changes his religion, kill him.’”

This event refers to the Sabaiyyah, who claimed divinity for Ali (RA), and is confirmed in multiple authentic sources.

15 - Ibn Abd Rabbih (d. 328 AH) confirmed that Ibn Saba and his sect, the Saba'iyya, exaggerated their beliefs about Ali when they said, "He is God, our Creator," just as the Christians exaggerated their beliefs about Christ, the son of Mary, peace be upon him. *Al-'Iqd al-Farīd* (2/405).

16 - Abu al-Hasan al-Ash'ari (d. 330 AH) mentions Abdullah ibn Saba and his sect among the extremist factions in *Maqālāt al-Islāmiyyīn* (1/85), stating that they claimed Ali did not die and that he would return to the world to fill it with justice as it had been filled with oppression.

17 - Ibn Hibban (d. 354 AH) in *Kitāb al-Majrūhīn* (2/253) states: "Al-Kalbi was a Saba'i from the followers of Abdullah ibn Saba, among those who said that Ali did not die and that he would return to the world before the Hour is established."

18 - Al-Maqdisi (d. 355 AH) in *Al-Bad' wa al-Tārīkh* (5/129) writes: "Abdullah ibn Saba said to the one who came to inform him of Ali ibn Abi Talib's death: 'Even if you brought us his brain in a bag, we would still know that he does not die until he leads the Arabs with his staff.'"

19 - Al-Maṭṭī (d. 377 AH) in *Al-Tanbīh wa al-Radd 'alā Ahl al-Ahwā' wa al-Bida'* (p. 18) writes: "During the time of Ali, the Saba'iyya came to him and said: 'You are you!!' He asked: 'Who am I?' They replied: 'The Creator, the Maker.' He ordered them to repent, but when they refused, he kindled a great fire and burned them."

20 - Abu Hafs Ibn Shahin (d. 385 AH) mentioned that Ali burned a group of extremist Shi'ites and exiled some of them, including Abdullah ibn Saba. Ibn Taymiyyah referenced this in *Minhāj al-Sunnah* (1/7).

21 - Al-Khwarizmi (d. 387 AH) in *Mafātīḥ al-'Ulūm* (p. 22) states that the Saba'iyya were the followers of Abdullah ibn Saba.

22 - Ibn al-Hamadhani (d. 415 AH) mentions Abdullah ibn Saba in *Tathbīt Dalā'il al-Nubuwwa* (3/548).

23 - Al-Baghdadi (d. 429 AH) in *Al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq* (p. 15 and beyond) writes that the Saba'iyya revealed their heresy during Ali's time. He burned some of them and exiled Ibn Saba to Sabat al-Madā'in after Ibn Abbas advised him against killing him, fearing that it would cause division among his followers, especially as Ali was preparing to fight the people of Sham.

24 - Ibn Hazm (d. 456 AH) in *Al-Faṣl fī al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* (4/186) writes: "The second category of extremist sects are those who attribute divinity to other than Allah, and the first among them were the followers of Abdullah ibn Saba al-Himyari—may Allah curse him—who went to Ali ibn Abi Talib and said to him directly: 'You are He.' Ali asked: 'Who is He?' They said: 'You are God.' He was horrified and ordered a fire to be kindled, and he burned them."

25 - Al-Asfarayini (d. 471 AH) in *Al-Tabsira fī al-Dīn* (p. 108) states: "Ibn Saba initially claimed prophethood for Ali, then later claimed his divinity and called upon people to believe in it, and a group followed him during Ali's time."

26 - Al-Shahrastani (d. 548 AH) in *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥāl* (2/116, 155) states: "From him (Ibn Saba) various extremist sects branched out," and in another place he says: "Ibn Saba was the first to openly advocate the idea of divine appointment (naṣṣ) for Ali's leadership."

27 - Al-Samʿani (d. 562 AH) in *Al-Ansāb* (7/24) attributes the Sabaʿiyya sect to Abdullah ibn Saba.

28 - Ibn Asakir (d. 571 AH) in *Tārīkh Madīnat Dimashq* (29/3) wrote a biography of Ibn Saba, stating: "Abdullah ibn Saba, to whom the Sabaʿiyya sect—extremist Rāfiḍa—is attributed, was originally from Yemen and was a Jew who professed Islam."

29 - Nashwān al-Ḥimyarī (d. 573 AH) in *Al-Ḥūr al-ʿĪn* (p. 154) writes: "The Sabaʿiyya said that Ali is alive and has not died, and he will not die until he fills the earth with justice as it was filled with oppression and restores people to one religion before the Day of Judgment."

30 - Fakhr al-Dīn al-Rāzī (d. 606 AH) in *Iʿtiqādāt Firqat al-Muslimīn wa al-Mushrikīn* (p. 57) affirms, like many scholars of sects and doctrines, the account of Ali burning a faction of the Sabaʿiyya.

31 - Ibn al-Athir (d. 630 AH) in *Al-Lubāb* (2/98) links the Sabaʿiyya sect to Abdullah ibn Saba. He also includes narrations from al-Tabari in *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* (3/114, 144, 147, 147, 154, and other pages) after removing the chains of narration.

32 - Al-Saksaki (d. 683 AH) in *Al-Burhān fī Maʿrifat ʿAqāʾid Ahl al-Adyān* states: "Ibn Saba and his group were the first to advocate the belief in returning to the world after death (rajaʿa)."

33 - Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah (d. 727 AH) stated that the origin of Rafḍ (Shiʿism) comes from the hypocritical heretics, as it was initiated by Ibn Saba, the heretic, who introduced extremism regarding Ali by claiming his divinely appointed leadership (imāma) and asserting his infallibility. See *Majmūʿ al-Fatāwā* (4/435) and (28/483), as well as many pages in his book *Minhāj al-Sunnah al-Nabawiyya*.

34 - Al-Māliqī (d. 741 AH) mentions Abdullah ibn Saba in his book *Al-Tamhīd wa al-Bayān fī Maqtal al-Shahīd ʿUthmān* (p. 54), saying: "In the year 33 AH, a group began to stir unrest against ʿUthmān (may Allah be pleased with him)... Among them were Mālik al-Ashtar, al-Aswad ibn Yazīd, and Abdullah ibn Saba, known as Ibn al-Sawdāʿ."

35 - Al-Dhahabi (d. 748 AH) in *Al-Mughni fī al-Ḍuʿafāʾ* (1/339) and *Al-Mīzān* (2/426) states: "Abdullah ibn Saba was among the extremist Shia, a deviant misleader." He also mentions him in *Tārīkh al-Islām* (2/122-123).

36 - Al-Safadi (d. 764 AH) in *Al-Wāfi bil-Wafayāt* (17/20) writes in the biography of Ibn Saba: "Abdullah ibn Saba was the leader of the Sabaʿiyya sect... He told Ali, 'You are God,' so Ali exiled him to al-Madāʾin. After Ali was killed (may Allah be pleased with him), Ibn Saba claimed that he had not died because he had a divine essence within him. He said that Ibn Muljam had only killed a devil that took Ali's form and that Ali was in the clouds, with thunder being his voice and lightning his whip, and that he would descend to the earth again."

37 - Ibn Kathir (d. 774 AH) in *Al-Bidāya wa al-Nihāya* (7/183) states that one of the causes of the coalition against ‘Uthmān was the emergence of Ibn Saba and his movement to Egypt, where he spread fabricated claims.

38 - In *Al-Firaq al-Islāmiyya* (p. 34), al-Karmāni (d. 786 AH) states that when Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) was killed, Abdullah ibn Saba claimed that he had not died and that he had a divine essence within him.

39 - Al-Shāṭibi (d. 790 AH) in *Al-I’tiṣām* (2/197) notes that the innovation (bid‘a) of the Saba’iyya is an ideological heresy that involves belief in a deity alongside Allah, making it distinct from other sectarian beliefs.

40 - Ibn Abi al-‘Izz al-Ḥanafī (d. 792 AH) in his commentary on *Al-‘Aqīda al-Ṭahāwiyya* (p. 578) states that Abdullah ibn Saba professed Islam but sought to corrupt it, just as Paul did with Christianity.

41 - Al-Jurjāni (d. 816 AH) in *Al-Ta’rīfāt* (p. 79) describes Abdullah ibn Saba as the leader of the Saba’iyya sect, noting that his followers, when hearing thunder, would say: “Peace be upon you, O Commander of the Faithful.”

42 - Al-Maqrīzi (d. 845 AH) in *Al-Khiṭaṭ* (2/356-357) states: “Abdullah ibn Saba emerged during the time of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him), introducing the beliefs of divine appointment (waṣiyya), return (raj‘a), and reincarnation (tanāsukh).”

43 - The hadith scholar Ibn Ḥajar (d. 852 AH) in *Lisān al-Mīzān* (3/290) compiled reports about Ibn Saba from sources other than Sayf ibn ‘Umar, then commented: “The reports about Abdullah ibn Saba are well-known in historical records, and he has no chain of narration in hadith, and praise be to Allah for that.”

44 - Al-‘Aynī (d. 855 AH) in *‘Iqd al-Jumān* (9/168) states: “Ibn Saba entered Egypt, traveled across its regions, promoted enjoining good, spoke about the concept of return (raj‘a), and instilled it in the hearts of the Egyptians.”

45 - Al-Suyūṭī (d. 911 AH) in *Lub al-Albāb fī Taḥrīr al-Ansāb* (1/132) affirms the attribution of the Saba’iyya sect to Abdullah ibn Saba.

46 - Al-Saffārīni (d. 1188 AH) in *Lawāmi‘ al-Anwār* (1/80) mentions the Saba’iyya sect among the Shi‘i factions, stating: “They were the followers of Abdullah ibn Saba, who said to the Commander of the Faithful, Ali ibn Abi Talib (may Allah be pleased with him): ‘You are truly God.’ Ali burned those who held this belief, digging trenches and throwing them into the fire.”

47 - Al-Zabīdī (d. 1205 AH) narrates that the “Saba” mentioned in the hadith of Furwa ibn Musayk al-Muradi was the father of Abdullah ibn Saba, the extremist leader of the Saba’iyya. *Tāj al-‘Arūs* (1/75-76). However, this claim by Al-Zabīdī is incorrect and contradicts the hadith of Furwa ibn Musayk. See *Ṣaḥīḥ Sunan Abī Dāwūd* (Hadith No. 3373) and *Jāmi‘ al-Tirmidhī* (Hadith No. 3220) in the section on the interpretation of Surah Saba’. The hadith provides additional details, stating that Saba’ was a man from the Arabs who had ten sons, six of whom settled in Yemen and four in Sham. These sons became the ancestors

of various Arab tribes, such as Lakhm, Judhām, and Ghassān. This indicates that Saba' was an ancient Arab forefather, making it unrelated to Saba', the supposed father of Abdullah ibn Saba, the founder of the Saba'iyya sect.

48 - 'Abd al-'Azīz ibn Walī Allāh al-Dihlawī (d. 1239 AH) in his book *Mukhtaṣar al-Tuḥfa al-Ithnā'Ashariyya* (p. 317) speaks about Ibn Saba, saying: "One of the greatest calamities in Islam at that time was that Satan appointed one of the devils of the Jews over the second generation of Muslims, disguising himself as a Muslim and pretending to be protective of the religion and its people... This devil was none other than Abdullah ibn Saba, a Jew from Ṣan'ā', known as Ibn al-Sawdā'. He spread his doctrine with cunning, gradualism, and deception."

49 - Muḥammad Ṣiddīq Ḥasan Khān (d. 1307 AH) mentions him in *Khabī'at al-Akwān fī Iftirāq al-Umam 'alā al-Madhāhib wa al-Adyān* (pp. 8, 33, 44).

This is what was gathered from the statements of scholars and the predecessors of the Ummah. There are many more, and they all confirm and agree on the existence of Abdullah ibn Saba as a real historical figure, not a fabrication. I have preferred to mention the early scholars because if they affirmed his existence, they are more knowledgeable than us. They had access to many books that are now considered lost, and they are the foundation upon which we rely. Moreover, there are many contemporary scholars who also affirm the existence of Ibn Saba. For an important reference, see *Al-'Unṣuriyya al-Yahūdiyya wa Āthāruhā fī al-Mujtama' al-Islāmī wa al-Mawqif Minhā* by Dr. Aḥmad ibn 'Abdullāh ibn Ibrāhīm al-Zughaybī (2/530-531), where he lists many contemporary scholars who confirm the historical existence of Ibn Saba.

B – Shi'i Scholars Who Affirm the Existence of Ibn Saba:

1 - In *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (5/193), Abū Mikhnaḥ – Lūṭ ibn Yaḥyā (d. 157 AH) describes Ma'qil ibn Qays al-Riyāhī, who was assigned by al-Mughīra ibn Shu'ba, the governor of Mu'āwiya over Kufa, to fight al-Mustawrid ibn 'Alfa al-Khārijī and his followers, calling him "one of the fabricating liars of the Saba'iyya."

2 - Al-Aṣḥfahānī (d. 283 AH) is mentioned by Dr. Aḥmad al-Zughaybī in *Al-'Unṣuriyya al-Yahūdiyya* (2/528).

3 - Al-Nāshī' al-Akbar (d. 293 AH) in *Masā'il al-Imāma* (pp. 22-23) states: "A sect claimed that 'Alī (may Allah be pleased with him) is alive and has not died, and that he will not die until he leads the Arabs with his staff. These are the Saba'iyya, the followers of Abdullah ibn Saba. Ibn Saba was a Jew from Ṣan'ā' who later settled in al-Madā'in."

4 - Al-Qummī (d. 301 AH) in *Al-Maqālāt wa al-Firaq* (p. 20) reports that Abdullah ibn Saba was the first to openly criticize Abū Bakr, 'Umar, 'Uthmān, and the Companions, renouncing them and claiming that 'Alī had ordered him to do so.

5 - Al-Nawbakhtī (d. 310 AH) in *Firaq al-Shī'a* (p. 23) records that when Ibn Saba received the news of 'Alī's death in al-Madā'in, he said to the bearer of the news: "You lie! Even if you brought us his brain in seventy pouches and presented seventy witnesses to his murder, we would not believe that he died or was killed. He will not die until he rules the earth."

6 - Abū Ḥātim al-Rāzī (d. 322 AH) in *Al-Zīna fī al-Kalimāt al-Islāmiyya* (p. 305) states: “Abdullah ibn Saba and those who followed his doctrine among the Saba’iyya claimed that ‘Alī was God, that he resurrects the dead, and they also claimed his occultation after his death.”

7 - Al-Kashshī (d. 340 AH) in *Al-Rijāl* (pp. 98-99) narrates from Abū Ja‘far Muḥammad al-Bāqir that Abdullah ibn Saba claimed prophethood and asserted that the Commander of the Faithful (‘Alī, peace be upon him) was God—highly exalted is He above such claims. There are similar statements from Ja‘far al-Ṣādiq and ‘Alī ibn al-Ḥusayn, who cursed Abdullah ibn Saba (pp. 70, 100) in the same book.

8 - Abū Ja‘far al-Ṣadūq ibn Bābawayh al-Qummī (d. 381 AH) in *Man Lā Yaḥḍuruhu al-Faqīh* (1/213) mentions Ibn Saba objecting to ‘Alī (may Allah be pleased with him) raising his hands to the sky during supplication.

9 - Shaykh al-Mufīd (d. 413 AH) in *Sharḥ ‘Aqā’id al-Ṣudūr* (p. 257) mentions the extremists (ghulāt) who falsely claimed Islam—referring to the Saba’iyya—who attributed divinity and prophethood to the Commander of the Faithful ‘Alī and his descendants. ‘Alī ruled that they should be executed and burned in fire.

10 - Abū Ja‘far al-Ṭūsī (d. 460 AH) in *Tahdhīb al-Aḥkām* (2/322) states that Ibn Saba reverted to disbelief and openly expressed extremist views (ghuluww).

11 - Ibn Shahrāshūb (d. 588 AH) mentions him in *Manāqib Āl Abī Ṭālib* (1/227-228).

12 - Ibn Abī al-Ḥadīd (d. 655 AH) in his *Sharḥ Nahj al-Balāgha* (2/99) mentions: “When the Commander of the Faithful (peace be upon him) was killed, Ibn Saba openly proclaimed his views, and he gathered a faction and followers who believed him and followed him.”

13 - Al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī al-Ḥillī (d. 726 AH) in his *Kitāb al-Rijāl* (2/71) refers to Ibn Saba as one of the types of weak figures.

14 - Ibn al-Murtaḍā (d. 840 AH) – a leader of the Zaidi Shia – believes that the origin of Shī‘ism traces back to Ibn Saba, as he was the first to introduce the claim of the text on Imāma. In *Tāj al-‘Arūs* by Ibn al-Murtaḍā (p. 5, 6).

15 - Al-Urdubīlī (d. 1100 AH) in his *Jāmi‘ al-Ruwāt* (1/485) claims that Ibn Saba was an accursed extremist who claimed the divinity and prophethood of ‘Alī.

16 - Al-Majlisī (d. 1110 AH) in *Bihār al-Anwār* (25/286-287).

17 - Ni‘mat Allāh al-Jazā‘irī (d. 1112 AH) in his book *Al-Anwār al-Nu‘māniyya* (2/234) mentions: “Abdullah ibn Saba said to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib (may Allah be pleased with him): ‘You are truly God.’ ‘Alī exiled him to al-Madā’in, and it was said that he was a Jew who converted to Islam, and in his Judaism, he said similar things about Yusha‘ ibn Nūn and Moses as he said about ‘Alī.”

18 - Ṭāhir al-‘Āmilī (d. 1138 AH) in the introduction to *Mir‘āt al-Anwār wa Mishkāt al-Asrār* in the interpretation of the Qur’ān (p. 62).

19 - Al-Mamaqānī (d. 1323 AH) in his Tanqīḥ al-Maqāl fī Aḥwāl al-Rijāl (2/183) mentions Ibn Saba among several quotes he cites from earlier Shia sources.

20 - As for Muḥammad Ḥusayn al-Muẓaffarī (d. 1369 AH), a contemporary Shia scholar, he does not deny the existence of Ibn Saba, although he denies any connection of Ibn Saba to the Shia. See Tārīkh al-Shīʿa (p. 10).

21 - As for al-Khwānsarī, Ibn Saba is mentioned by him through Jaʿfar al-Ṣādiq, who cursed Ibn Saba for his accusations of lying and forgery. In Rawdat al-Jannāt (3/141).

Second: Denial of the Existence of Abdullah ibn Saba by Both Sects:

A – Denial of the Existence of Ibn Saba by Ahl al-Sunnah and Those Who Followed Them:

1 - Dr. Ṭāhā Ḥusayn, one of the prominent modern writers who doubted and denied the existence of Ibn Saba. See his book Al-Fitna al-Kubrā – ʿUthmān (p. 132) and ʿAlī wa Banūh (p. 90).

2 - Dr. ʿAlī Sāmī al-Nashār, who follows Ṭāhā Ḥusayn in denying the personality of Ibn Saba and considers him a fictitious figure. See Nashʿat al-Fikr al-Falsafī fī al-Islām (2/38–39).

3 - Dr. Ḥāmid Ḥanfī Dāwūd, who was influenced by Shia writings on Ibn Saba, denying his existence. He wrote the introduction to the book ʿAbdullāh ibn Saba wa Asāṭir ʿUkhrā and mentioned: “Finally, I am pleased to announce my admiration for this great work by its author, the scholar, Mr. Murtadā al-ʿAskarī.” His view on Ibn Saba is clarified when he says: “Perhaps one of the greatest historical mistakes that slipped through the hands of these researchers is the fabrication they made against Shia scholars when they concocted the story of Abdullah ibn Saba among other fabrications.” (1/18, 21). Also, in his book Al-Tashīʿ: Ṣāḥib al-Ṭabīʿyah fī Itḥār al-Daʿwah al-Islāmīyah (p. 18).

4 - Also, Dr. Muḥammad Kāmil Ḥusayn in his book Adab Miṣr al-Fāṭimīyah (p. 7).

5 - Also, ʿAbd al-ʿAzīz al-Ḥalābī in his book ʿAbdullāh ibn Saba (p. 73), where this person became an enigma due to the skepticism others raised regarding the existence of Ibn Saba, which led him to also deny it.

6 - It is worth mentioning that Professor Ḥassan ibn Farḥān al-Mālikī, a student of the aforementioned, is one of those who denies the existence of Ibn Saba and, at times, denies his role in the fitna. See his statements in the Al-Muslimūn newspaper, issues (657, 658).

7 - Among those who are skeptical or hesitant in affirming or denying the personality of Abdullah ibn Saba, Dr. Jawād ʿAlī, in an article titled “ʿAbdullāh ibn Saba” published in Majallat al-Majmaʿ al-ʿIlmī al-ʿIrāqī volume 6 (p. 84, 100) and also in Majallat al-Risāla issue (778) (pp. 609-610).

8 - Dr. Muḥammad ʿAmārah in his book Al-Khilāfah wa Nashʿat al-Aḥzāb al-Islāmīyah (pp. 154–155) says: “Most sources of Islamic history and thought attribute to this ‘black man’ (Ibn Saba) great activity and mythical efforts,” and he continues: “If we were to assume the existence of Ibn Saba.”

9 - Dr. ‘Abdullāh al-Sāmīrā’ī in his book *Al-Ghulū wa al-Firaq al-Ghālīyah fī al-Ḥaḍārah al-Islāmīyah* (p. 86) confirms the existence of the ideas attributed to Abdullah ibn Saba without asserting the existence of the person himself.

B - Denial of the Existence of Ibn Saba from the Shia:

1 - Muḥammad al-Ḥusayn Kāshef al-Ghitā’, in his book *Aṣl al-Shī‘ah wa Uṣūlihā* (p. 61), says: “It is not unlikely that he — meaning Abdullah ibn Saba — and others like Majnūn Banī ‘Āmir and Abū Hilāl... and their like, are mythological figures fabricated by storytellers to pass the time and entertain people.”

2 - Murtadā al-‘Askarī, who has two books on this topic, denies the existence of Ibn Saba altogether. He is considered one of the most prominent contemporary Shia scholars concerned with the issue of Abdullah ibn Saba. His first book is titled ‘Abdullāh ibn Saba: Baḥṭh ḥawla Mā Katabahu al-Mu‘arrikhūn wa al-Mustashriqūn Ibtidā’an min al-Qarn al-Thānī al-Hijrī (Part 1). His second book is titled ‘Abdullāh ibn Saba wa Asāṭīr ‘Ukhrā.

3 - Muḥammad Jawād Maghnīyah, who mentions this in his introduction to Murtadā al-‘Askarī’s ‘Abdullāh ibn Saba wa Asāṭīr ‘Ukhrā (1/12), and in his book *Al-Tashī‘* (p. 18).

4 - Dr. ‘Alī al-Wardī in his book *Wa‘āz al-Salāṭīn* (pp. 273–276) says: “It seems that the tale of Ibn Saba, from beginning to end, was a carefully crafted and brilliantly told story,” and considers ‘Alī al-Wardī the innovator of the claim that Ibn Saba was actually ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir (may Allah be pleased with him) (p. 278).

5 - ‘Abdullāh al-Fayyāḍ in his book *Tārīkh al-Imāmīyah wa Aslāfihim min al-Shī‘ah* (p. 95) says: “It seems that Ibn Saba was a character closer to imagination than to reality.”

6 - Dr. Kāmil Muṣṭafā al-Shībī in his book *Al-Ṣilah bayn al-Ṣūfīyah wa al-Tashī‘* (p. 41) followed Dr. ‘Alī al-Wardī’s view on the claim that ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir was the ‘black man’ (Ibn Saba), (p. 88).

7 - Ṭālib al-Rifā‘ī in *Al-Tashī‘: Zāhirah Ṭabī‘īyah fī Iṭār al-Da‘wah al-Islāmīyah* (p. 20).

It seems this almost collective denial by those Shia scholars of the existence of Abdullah ibn Saba is aimed at negating the Jewish influence on Shia beliefs and clearing their names from any association with Ibn Saba, but they cannot undo it.

I was struck by a statement from Dr. Sa‘dī al-Hāshimī, who says: “With these clear quotes and texts from the books of the Shia, the true nature of Ibn Saba as a Jew becomes evident. Those Shia who have attacked this truth have cast doubt on their own books, which have recorded the curses of the infallible imams on this Jew (Ibn Saba), and it is impossible to imagine that such curses would be directed at an unknown figure. Also, in their belief, it is impermissible to deny what the infallible have said.” *Ibn Saba: Ḥaḳīqah Lā Khayāl* (p. 76).

C – Those who Confirm the Existence of Ibn Saba from Orientalists:

Orientalists have taken an interest in the issue of Abdullah ibn Saba and studied what has been said about him. We do not need these spiteful figures to prove the existence of Ibn Saba, but I mention them here only to show that wisdom is the lost property of the believer,

wherever he finds it, he is most deserving of it, as ‘Abī Hurayrah (may Allah be pleased with him) did when he learned the merit of Ayat al-Kursī from Iblīs (may Allah curse him). *Sahīḥ al-Bukhārī* with al-Fath (4/487–488).

1 - The German Orientalist Julius Wellhausen (1844–1918), says: “The origin of the Saba’īyah traces back to the time of ‘Alī and al-Ḥasan, and is attributed to Abdullah ibn Saba, and as his strange name suggests, he was also from Yemen, specifically from the capital Sana’a, and it is said he was a Jew.” In his book *Al-Khawārij wa al-Shī‘ah* (pp. 170–171).

2 - The Orientalist Van Vloten (1866–1903) believes that the Saba’īyah faction is attributed to Abdullah ibn Saba, saying: “As for the Saba’īyah, the supporters of Abdullah ibn Saba, who believed in the right of ‘Alī to the caliphate since the time of ‘Uthmān, they believed that a divine part manifested in ‘Alī and then in his successors after him.” In *Al-Sīdah al-‘Arabīyah wa al-Shī‘īyah wa al-Isrā’īlīyāt fī ‘Ahd Banī Umayyah* (p. 80).

3 - The Italian Orientalist: Caitani (1869–1926), concludes in his research, published in *Annals of Islam*, volume eight, from the years (33–35 AH), that Ibn Saba exists in reality, but he denies the narratives of Sīf ibn ‘Umar in *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* which suggest that the conspiracy that overthrew ‘Uthmān had religious motives. He also denies that Ibn Saba’s deification of ‘Alī occurred during his time, concluding that these views were a product of Shia ideologies in the second half of the second century of the Hijra.

4 - The Orientalist: Lévi Délavida (born in 1886), mentions Abdullah ibn Saba in his discussion of ‘Alī’s caliphate in his book *Ansāb al-Ashrāf* by al-Balādhurī.

5 - The German Orientalist: Isrā’īl Frīd Lander, wrote an article about Abdullah ibn Saba in the Assyrian journal in the issues from the years (1909, p. 322) and (1910, p. 23) titled: “Abdullāh ibn Saba: The Founder of Shī‘ah and His Jewish Origins.” In his research, which spans over eighty pages, he concludes that he has no doubt whatsoever about the existence of Ibn Saba.

6 - The Hungarian Orientalist: Gold Tzīher (1921), says: “As well as the excessive deification of ‘Alī that was first formulated by Abdullah ibn Saba.” In his book *Aqīdah wa Sharī‘ah fī al-Islām* (p. 205).

7 - Reynold Nickels (1945), says in his book *Tārīkh al-Adab al-‘Arabī* (p. 215): “Abdullāh ibn Saba, who founded the Saba’īyah sect, was from Sana’a, Yemen, and it is said that he was Jewish. He converted to Islam during ‘Uthmān’s time and became a wandering preacher.”

8 - Dawit M. Ronaldson, says: “Since the time of ‘Uthmān, there appeared a wandering preacher named Abdullāh ibn Saba, who traveled across the Islamic lands, wanting to corrupt the Muslims, as reported by al-Ṭabarī.” In *Aqīdah al-Shī‘ah* (p. 85).

9 - The British Orientalist: Bernard Lewis, believes that Abdullah ibn Saba is the origin of Shī‘ism. Refer to his discussion in his book *Aṣūl al-Islāmīyah* (p. 86).

These are the most important Orientalist writings on the topic of Abdullah ibn Saba. There are many others, but for significance, refer to the book ‘Abdullāh ibn Saba wa Atharuhu fī Aḥdāth al-Fitnah fī Ṣadr al-Islām by Dr. Sulaymān al-‘Awda (p. 73).

As for the few Orientalists who denied the existence of Ibn Saba, they consider his character a mere myth and doubtful, and there is no need to mention them since their ideas are not widely spread, unlike those who affirm his existence, as they are well-known Orientalists whose opinions are relied upon by many influenced by Orientalist thought. The aim of these Orientalists in doubting or denying his existence was to claim that the turmoil was the result of the actions of the Companions themselves, and attributing it to Jews or heretics was a defense of the Companions used by the Muslim historians and narrators to shift the blame for the errors of the Companions onto other elements. However, some of them deny the existence of Ibn Saba due to their desire to reach the following conclusion: there is no need for a saboteur among the Companions, as the motives of greed, love for the world, and power had overtaken them, leading them to fight each other deliberately. The purpose of this was to harm Islam and its followers, and to instill in people’s minds that if Islam failed to reform the morals, behavior, and unity of the Companions shortly after the Prophet’s (PBUH) departure, it is incapable of being a method of reform in this era. See: Taḥqīq Mawāqif al-Ṣaḥābah fī al-Fitnah by Dr. Muḥammad Amḥazūn (1/314).

Evidence for Denying the Existence of Abdullah ibn Saba and Responses to Them

Their evidence can be summarized as follows, and I will respond to each of their arguments:

First: They said: The historians’ neglect of mentioning Ibn Saba or “the black man” in the Battle of Ṣiffīn, and how he was absent from it despite having been active in the Battle of the Camel. They couldn’t explain why he was absent from this battle, which suggests that he didn’t exist.

Response: The historians, when discussing a particular subject, do not necessarily include all the details of the events and occurrences they mention in their books. This is assuming that Ibn Saba participated in the Battle of Ṣiffīn. Even if he did not participate in the Battle of Ṣiffīn, does that prove his non-existence? Can this contradict what historians, both Sunni and Shia, have established about the existence of Ibn Saba and his role? In my opinion, this objection does not hold up against what historians and researchers have affirmed, both from the Sunni and Shia sides, regarding Ibn Saba’s existence.

Second: They said: The reports about Ibn Saba spread among the people through al-Ṭabarī, and al-Ṭabarī took them from Sīf ibn ‘Umar. Therefore, Sīf is the sole source of the news about Ibn Saba, and since Sīf is a liar and was weakened by the scholars of jarḥ wa-ta’dīl (the science of narrators’ evaluation), this calls into question the reliability of these reports.

Response – This will be addressed in three parts:

A – Al-Ṭabarī as the sole source of the reports about Ibn Saba, and these reports all coming from Sīf ibn ‘Umar.

Response: This claim is false because al-Ṭabarī was not the only one who narrated Sīf's reports. There are reports from Sīf about Ibn Saba that do not appear in al-Ṭabarī. For example:

1. From Ibn Asākir (d. 571 AH) in his Tārīkh (29/9), he included a narration from Sīf ibn 'Umar not found in al-Ṭabarī.
2. From al-Mālaqī (d. 741 AH) in his book al-Tamhīd wa al-Bayān (p. 54), he included a narration not found in al-Ṭabarī from Sīf ibn 'Umar.
3. From al-Dhahabī (d. 748 AH) in his book Tārīkh al-Islām (2/122–123), this narration is also not found in al-Ṭabarī.

These three chains show that al-Ṭabarī did not exclusively rely on Sīf ibn 'Umar's reports about Ibn Saba, and he was not the sole source of these narrations.

B – Sīf ibn 'Umar as the sole source of the news about Ibn Saba.

Response: This claim is also incorrect. There are reports mentioning Ibn Saba where Sīf is not in the chain of narrators. Through research and investigation, it becomes evident that Sīf ibn 'Umar was not the sole source of information about Abdullah ibn Saba. I will provide several narrations from Ibn Asākir that mention Ibn Saba without Sīf being part of the chain. I chose to refer to Ibn Asākir specifically because he follows a chain-based narration method, just like al-Ṭabarī in his history.

First narration: Ibn Asākir narrated from al-Shu'abī, who said: "The first to lie about Abdullah ibn Saba was..."

Second narration: Ibn Asākir narrated from 'Amr al-Dahānī, who said: "I heard Abū al-Ṭufayl say: 'I saw al-Musayyib ibn Najbah brought to Yalabbah (the black man), and 'Alī was on the pulpit. 'Alī said: "What is his issue?" He was told: "He lies about Allah and His Messenger."'"

Third narration: Ibn Asākir narrated from Zayd ibn Wahb, who said: "'Alī said: 'What is it with me and this black man?'"

Fourth narration: Ibn Asākir narrated from Shu'bah from Salmah, who said: "I heard Abū al-Z'arā' narrating from 'Alī who said: 'What is it with me and this black man?'"

Fifth narration: Ibn Asākir narrated from Shu'bah from Salmah ibn Kuhayl from Zayd, who said: "'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib said: 'What is it with me and this black man?' (meaning Abdullah ibn Saba) who would speak ill of Abū Bakr and 'Umar."

Sixth narration: Ibn Asākir narrated from Salmah ibn Kuhayl from Ḥujjah ibn 'Adī al-Kindī, who said: "I saw 'Alī (may Allah honor his face) on the pulpit, and he said: 'Who will excuse me from this black man who lies about Allah and His Messenger?' (referring to Ibn al-Sudā'), 'If it weren't for the fact that groups will continue to rise accusing me of bloodshed as they claimed against me at Nahrawān, I would have disposed of them.'"

Seventh narration: Ibn Asākir narrated from Abū al-Aḥwāṣ from al-Mughīrah from Samāk, who said: "It reached 'Alī that the black man was criticizing Abū Bakr and 'Umar, so he

summoned him and ordered a sword be brought, or he said he was about to kill him. They spoke to him, and he said: 'He will not live in a town where I live.' So he sent him to al-Madā'in." *Tārīkh Dimashq* by Ibn Asākir (29/7–10).

For more on reports about Abdullah ibn Saba without the chain of Sīf ibn 'Umar, refer to episodes (3 and 4) of the Abdullāh ibn Saba article series.

C – Sīf ibn 'Umar (d. 180 AH) as a liar, weakened by the scholars of *jarḥ wa-ta'dīl*.

Response: The status of Sīf ibn 'Umar in the science of narrators' evaluation should be clarified for the reader.

First: Sīf ibn 'Umar as a narrator...

Al-Nasā'ī says in *Al-Du'afā' wa al-Matrūkīn* (p. 14): "Sīf ibn 'Umar al-Ḍabbī is weak." Ibn Abī Ḥātim mentioned in *Al-Jarḥ wa al-Ta'dīl* (2/278) that Sīf ibn 'Umar is "abandoned in narrations, and his narration is similar to that of al-Wāqidī." Ibn Ma'īn said in the same source (2/278) that Sīf is weak in narration. Al-Dhahabī mentioned in *Kāshif al-Zunūb* (1/416) that Sīf ibn 'Umar is a narrator found in the six books and stated: "Ibn Ma'īn and others weakened him." In *Al-Mughni fī al-Ḍu'afā'* (p. 292), Al-Dhahabī said: "Sīf ibn 'Umar al-Tamīmī al-Asadī has works but is unanimously abandoned." Ibn Ḥajar in *Al-Taqrīb* (1/344) said: "Sīf is weak in narration." Ibn Ḥibbān in *Al-Majrūḥīn* (1/345) said: "Sīf ibn 'Umar al-Ḍabbī al-Asadī from Basrah was accused of heresy... he narrates fabricated reports from the trustworthy."

This concerns Sīf ibn 'Umar as a narrator, but what might be his status as a historian?

Before mentioning the scholars' opinions on him, it must be noted that there is a difference between narrating ḥadīth and narrating other reports. The former is the foundation of jurisprudence and law, thus scholars (may Allah have mercy on them) were very strict in their conditions for accepting narrations. However, the situation differs with historical narrations. While they are important—especially when relating to the Companions—they are not scrutinized as much as ḥadīth. Therefore, this principle must be applied to Sīf as a narrator and historian. For further details, refer to *Taḥqīq Muwāqif al-Ṣaḥābah fī al-Fitnah* by Dr. Muḥammad Amḥazūn (1/82-143), where he discusses this topic well.

Now, turning to the books of narrators, we find the following:

Al-Dhahabī in *Mīzān al-I'tidāl* (2/255) says: "He was a historian and knowledgeable." Ibn Ḥajar in *Taqrīb al-Tahdhīb* (1/344) says: "He is an authority in history." As for Ibn Ḥibbān's accusation of heresy against Sīf, Ibn Ḥajar answers in *Taqrīb* (1/344) saying: "Ibn Ḥibbān was excessive in his criticism of him." It is not correct to accuse Sīf of heresy without evidence, as his narrations in the fitnah and his accounts of the events between the Companions show that his style was far from that of heretics. He was the one who exposed and uncovered the heretics like Ibn Saba!

After this, it cannot be doubted that Sīf's narrations are more reliable than those of other historians like Abū Mikhnaḥ, al-Wāqidī, Ibn al-Kalbī, and many others. Sīf's narrations align with the authentic reports narrated by trustworthy individuals and are taken from those who

witnessed or were close to the events. For more on this subject, refer to *Istishhād ‘Uthmān wa Waq‘at al-Jamal* by Dr. Khalid bin Muhammad al-Ghaith (p. 19-40), and *‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ wa Atharuhu fī Aḥdāth al-Fitnah fī Ṣadr al-Islām* by Dr. Sulaymān al-‘Awda (p. 104-110).

Third: They said: Ibn Saba did not exist, and he was, in fact, a symbolic representation of ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir. They presented several points to support this claim, including:

1. Ibn Saba was known as “Ibn al-Sudā’,” and ‘Ammār was also known by this nickname.
2. Both of them were of Yemeni descent, tracing back to Saba’ ibn Yashjub, the origin of the people of Yemen.
3. Both were ardently devoted to ‘Alī and among those who urged people to pledge allegiance to him.
4. ‘Ammār’s journey to Egypt during the time of ‘Uthmān, where he encouraged people against ‘Uthmān, is attributed to Ibn Saba.
5. It is attributed to Ibn Saba that ‘Uthmān took the caliphate unjustly, and that the rightful caliph was ‘Alī. This is the same position held by ‘Ammār.
6. Both are said to have obstructed peace efforts during the Battle of the Camel.
7. It is claimed that Ibn Saba was the instigator of Abū Dharr’s socialist movement, and ‘Ammār had a very close relationship with Abū Dharr.

Response: This opinion reflects ignorance. This view is refuted by the books of *jarḥ wa-ta’dīl* and the trustworthy books of men’s biographies in Shī‘ī sources. They mention ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir among the Companions of ‘Alī and as a narrator from him; he is one of the four key figures in their tradition. Then, in another section, they mention the biography of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba in the context of cursing and reviling him. See: *Rijāl al-Ṭūsī* (p. 46, 51) and *Rijāl al-Ḥillī* (p. 255, 469). Can we then consider these two individuals to be the same?

The similarity between the two personalities, both of whom went to Egypt during the time of ‘Uthmān, does not, upon reviewing the texts and understanding their historical context, support the claim that Ibn Saba and ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir were the same person. This factor actually serves as evidence for the independence of the two personalities. ‘Ammār was sent by ‘Uthmān to Egypt in the year 35 AH, while Ibn Saba emerged in 30 AH, as mentioned by al-Ṭabarī (4/241), who is the source for both reports. Furthermore, al-Ṭabarī himself states that among those who influenced ‘Ammār in Egypt were people, including ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba. This is found in al-Ṭabarī (4/341), as well as in *Al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah* by Ibn Kathīr (7/167), *Al-Kāmil fī al-Tārīkh* by Ibn al-Athīr (3/77), and *Tārīkh Ibn Khaldūn* (2/1034). These are all major historians who have established the existence of both Ibn Saba and ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir. How, then, can any rational person claim that they were the same individual?

As for the claim that ‘Ammār was from Yemen and that every Yemeni can be called Ibn Saba, this is incorrect. Saba’ is merely a part of the vast region of Yemen, as Ya‘qūt mentions in *Mu‘jam al-Buldan* (3/181).

Regarding the assertion that ‘Ammār claimed ‘Uthmān took the caliphate unjustly and that its rightful owner was ‘Alī, this is an unsubstantiated claim. In fact, it is established that ‘Uthmān trusted ‘Ammār and sent him to Egypt to manage its affairs. Refer to al-Ṭabarī (4/341).

The similarity in their kunyas (nicknames) does not make them one person, and the historical circumstances and the characteristics of each personality do not allow for this conclusion. A quick look at the biographical dictionaries and the books of narrators gives the reader a broad understanding of why scholars of jarḥ wa al-ta’dīl compiled works detailing similar names and kunyas.

Another important point is that ‘Ammār was killed during the Battle of Ṣiffīn, while Ibn Saba survived until after the martyrdom of ‘Alī, may Allah be pleased with him. Can it then be said that ‘Ammār ibn Yāsir was ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba?

Fourth: They claimed that Ibn Saba did not exist in reality and was merely a fictional character invented by the enemies of the Shī‘ah to discredit their sect by attributing it to a Jewish man.

Response: This is a claim without evidence. Just as you made this claim, others can claim whatever they wish, but what matters is the argument and evidence. Your assertion that this story was fabricated by Ahl al-Sunnah to discredit the Shī‘ah is baseless, for the sources of the Shī‘ah themselves, as previously mentioned, have confirmed the existence of Ibn Saba. This refutes your objection that the story is a fabrication of Ahl al-Sunnah.

After the points I have made and the refutations of these doubts, I can say that the reason for the Shī‘ah’s denial of Ibn Saba’s existence lies in their beliefs, which have spread among the different Shī‘ah sects. These beliefs conflict with the core principles of Islam and place them in a position of suspicion. Additionally, the historical animosity in the hearts of Shī‘ah toward the Companions of the Prophet, may Allah be pleased with them, and their desire to portray them as the ones who instigated the fitnah, contribute to this denial.

In conclusion, after reviewing both the ancient and modern sources from both the Sunnī and Shī‘ī perspectives, it is confirmed that the existence of ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba was real, supported by historical reports. His role is evident in both the works of ‘Aqā‘id and Tārīkh, as well as in books of ḥadīth, narrators, genealogies, and literature. Many modern scholars and researchers have followed this line of investigation.

The role of this Jew in igniting the fitnah during the caliphate of ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān, may Allah be pleased with him, is clear. It is important to note that while we may not always explicitly mention Ibn Saba in every discussion, this does not mean that he was absent or had no role. It is well-established, with clear and reliable evidence, that the hidden hand behind the conspiracy and the fitnah was that of the evil Jew, ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba. Additionally, we will not delve into the criticisms of ‘Uthmān by those who stirred the fitnah, as this is not the focus here. Perhaps, if Allah wills, we will address it in a separate article with commentary.

The Seeds of the Fitnah: The Main Cause, A Man Named ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’

His nickname was Ibn al-Sawdā' because his mother was an Ethiopian woman. He was from Ṣan'ā' and was a Jew from the Jews of Yemen. He outwardly embraced Islam but secretly maintained disbelief. He then adopted the Shi'ah belief in 'Alī, may Allah be pleased with him, and he is attributed to the Saba'iyyah sect, who claimed the divinity of 'Alī. The incident of 'Alī burning a group of them is documented in authentic narrations found in the correct ḥadīth collections, such as al-Muḥabbar by Ibn Ḥabīb (p. 308), Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī (4/340), Tārīkh Dimashq by Ibn Asākir (29/3), and books by Sa'dī Mahdī al-Ḥāshimī Ibn Saba': Ḥaḳīqah Lā Khayāl and 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' and His Influence on the Events of the Fitnah in Early Islam by Sulaymān al-'Awda. Also, see the article Ḥaḳīqat Ibn al-Sawdā' in al-Muslimūn newspaper by Dr. Sulaymān al-'Awda (issue 652–653). The incident of their burning is mentioned in: Sunan Abī Dāwūd (4/520), Sunan al-Nasā'ī (7/104), al-Mustadrak by al-Ḥākim (3/538–539), and authenticated by al-Albānī in Ṣaḥīḥ Abī Dāwūd (3/822).

When this man saw that Islam was spreading in such a manner, he realized that the only way to oppose it was through internal fitnah. He was extremely cunning, and he began by spreading his ideas in Madīnah, which at the time was filled with scholars. Every time he cast doubts, they were rebutted with knowledge. One of his ideas was to introduce certain Jewish beliefs, such as the concept of al-Raj'ah (return), specifically the return of the Prophet Muhammad, peace be upon him. He used the verse:

“Indeed, He who has made the Qur'an obligatory upon you will surely return you to a place of return.”

(Surah al-Qasas, 28:85)

He expressed his amazement at people who believe in the return of 'Īsā (Jesus), peace be upon him, but deny the return of Muhammad, peace be upon him. This statement was only a means to achieve something greater, where he then claimed the return of 'Alī, may Allah be pleased with him, and that he would fill the earth with justice just as it had been filled with tyranny.

For further reference, see 'Abd Allāh ibn Saba' and His Role in the Events of the Fitnah in Early Islam by Sulaymān al-'Awda (p. 208), and Shahādah 'Uthmān and the Battle of al-Jamal by Khālīd al-Ghayth (pp. 70–86).

To respond to them, I would like to point out that the verse which the Saba'iyyah use to support their claims actually serves as evidence against them. Ibn Kathīr, in his Tafsir (3/345), quotes the opinions of scholars on this matter. Some say it refers to the return on the Day of Judgment, where Allah will ask about the duties entrusted to the Prophets. Others interpret it as referring to returning to Paradise, to death, or to Makkah. Al-Bukhārī mentions the opinion of Ibn 'Abbās who said it refers to a return to Makkah (al-Fath 8/369), and al-Ṭabarī mentions it in his Tafsir (10/80–81).

'Āsim ibn 'Umar (d. 74 AH) asked al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī about the claim by some Shi'ah that 'Alī would return. He responded: “Those liars are wrong. If we knew that, we would not have married his wives or distributed his inheritance.” Musnad Ahmad (1/148).

In al-Ṭabaqāt by Ibn Sa'd (3/39), there is mention of the Saba'iyyah and the ideas of their leader, though Ibn Sa'd does not name Ibn Saba'. According to 'Amr ibn al-'Aṣam:

“It was said to al-Ḥasan ibn ‘Alī that some of the Shi‘ah of Abū al-Ḥasan ‘Alī claim that he is the creature of the earth and that he will return before the Day of Judgment. He said: ‘They are lying. Those are not his Shi‘ah; they are his enemies. If we knew that, we would not have divided his inheritance or married his wives.’”

One of the claims of Ibn Saba’ was also the idea of al-Waṣiyyah (the will) and the Imamate. Al-Shahrastānī mentions in *Al-Milal wa al-Niḥal* (1/174) that Ibn Saba’ was the first to publicly claim that ‘Alī was appointed by a divine will to be the Imam.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentions in *Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā* (4/435) that the origin of al-Rafḍ (rejection) came from the hypocrites and heretics, and that it was invented by Ibn Saba’ the heretic, who exaggerated in his veneration of ‘Alī, claiming that he was divinely appointed and that he was infallible.

In *Khutat al-Maqrīzī* (2/356–357), it is mentioned that ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’, during the time of ‘Alī, introduced the ideas of al-Waṣiyyah, al-Raj‘ah, and al-Tanāsukh (transmigration).

Among the Shi‘ah scholars who discussed the idea of the will is Muḥammad ibn Ya‘qūb al-Kulaynī (d. 329 AH), who in his book *Al-Kāfī* in the section on al-Usūl (foundations) included the following text: “The guardianship of ‘Alī is written in all the scriptures of the Prophets, and Allah will not send a Prophet except with the prophecy of Muhammad and the will of ‘Alī, peace be upon him.” See *Al-Sunnah wa al-Shi‘ah* by Iḥsān Ilaḥī Zāhir (p. 54).

**This exaggeration in the veneration of ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, may Allah be pleased with him, is in line with what is mentioned in the *Kitāb al-Sunnah* by Ibn Abī ‘Āsim with a sound chain of narration according to the criteria of the two Shaykhs (al-Bukhārī and Muslim) (2/476–477), where it is narrated from ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, may Allah be pleased with him, that he said: “A people will love me so much that they will enter the Fire because of me, and a people will hate me so much that they will enter the Fire because of their hatred for me.”

Shaykh al-Albānī commented on this ḥadīth, saying: “Know that this ḥadīth is attributed to ‘Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, but it is in effect like a ḥadīth from the Prophet, peace be upon him, because it deals with unseen matters that cannot be known through mere opinion.”

The summary of what Ibn Saba’ brought forward is that he presented truthful premises but built upon them corrupt principles that spread among the simpletons, the extremists, and those with misguided desires. He began interpreting the Qur’ān based on his corrupt understanding, and he also employed faulty analogy to claim that the appointment of ‘Alī, may Allah be pleased with him, was a matter of divine will. He argued that there were a thousand prophets, each having a successor, and that ‘Alī was the successor of Muhammad. He then said: “Muhammad is the Seal of the Prophets, and ‘Alī is the Seal of the Successors.” *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/340) narrated by Sayf ibn ‘Umar.

When Ibn Saba’ could not win over even a single person, he turned to the Levant (Shām), which was ruled by Mu‘āwiyah ibn Abī Sufyān, may Allah be pleased with him. When he went there, he could not win over even one man to his side, so he left the Levant and went to Kūfah, where it was teeming with fitnah, a fertile ground for spreading his doubts. This was why ‘Umar ibn al-Khaṭṭāb, may Allah be pleased with him, appointed al-Mughīrah ibn Shu‘bah, may Allah be pleased with him, to govern it, as he was one of the most firm

individuals. During ‘Umar’s time, no fitnah emerged in Kūfah. When ‘Uthmān became the caliph, he removed al-Mughīrah and appointed Sa‘īd ibn al-‘Āṣ, may Allah be pleased with him, who was from the Banū Umayyah. The people of Kūfah saw this as an exploitation of power, and thus fitnah began to spread there. ‘Abd Allāh ibn Saba’ found Kūfah to be fertile ground for his divisions, and he succeeded in gathering a group of followers. He then moved to Baṣrah and gathered another group. According to historians, their numbers at the very least were six hundred men, and at most they were one thousand. He then moved to Egypt and managed to gather between six hundred to a thousand men there as well. See: Shahādah ‘Uthmān and the Battle of al-Jamal from the narrations of Sayf ibn ‘Umar by Khālīd al-Ghayth (pp. 72–86), where the researcher excellently analyzes the situation.

Ibn Saba’ also used the Bedouins. He went to them and began spreading lies about ‘Uthmān, using forged books that he and his associates had written in the names of Ṭalḥah, al-Zubayr, and ‘Ā’ishah, complaining about ‘Uthmān’s governance. The Bedouins, who were not well-versed in the religion, were influenced by these lies and believed them, filling their hearts with animosity against ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him. Shahādah ‘Uthmān (pp. 87–99).

After this, Ibn Saba’ moved toward his main goal: inciting the people against Caliph ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him. This coincided with the desires of some of the people, so he told them: “‘Uthmān has taken power unjustly, and he is the appointed successor of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. Rise up against him, start attacking your leaders, and advocate for the command of good and the forbidding of evil to win the people over. Invite them to this cause.” Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī (4/341), narrated by Sayf ibn ‘Umar.

This text reveals the method used by Ibn Saba’. He aimed to create division among the people by presenting ‘Alī, may Allah be pleased with him, as the rightful one whose rights were denied, while depicting ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, as the usurper.

He then began urging his followers to send letters with tragic reports about the conditions of Egypt to the other regions, so that the people of Baṣrah would imagine that the situation in Egypt was worse than ever under their governor, and the people of Egypt would think that the situation in Kūfah was at its worst under their governor. The people of Madīnah also received letters from the regions, filled with bad news from the followers of Ibn Saba’. Thus, the people in all regions were led to believe that the situation could not get any worse, and the only beneficiaries of this situation were the Saba’īyah, because the people’s belief in these reports would ignite the spark of fitnah within the Muslim community.

‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, realized that something was being plotted in the regions and that the Ummah was heading toward disaster. He said: “By Allah, the mill of fitnah is turning, and how fortunate for ‘Uthmān if he dies without stirring it.” Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī (4/343), narrated by Sayf ibn ‘Umar.

Al-Tirmidhī narrated from Ibn ‘Umar, who said: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, mentioned a trial and said: “In it, this man will be killed unjustly” – referring to ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān. Sahīh Sunan al-Tirmidhī (3/210) and see: Fadā’il al-Ṣaḥābah by Imam Aḥmad (1/451).

Al-Tirmidhī also narrated in his Sunan (5/628) and Ibn Mājah from Ka'b ibn 'Ajjah, who said: The Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, mentioned a trial and explained it. A man passed by, covering his head, and the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: "This man is on the truth on that day." I immediately stood and grabbed 'Uthmān's arm, then I faced the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and asked: "Is this the one?" He replied: "Yes." Musnad (4/242), Sahīh Ibn Mājah (1/24–25), Sahīh Sunan al-Tirmidhī (3/210), and Fadā'il al-Ṣaḥābah by Imam Aḥmad (1/450).

What happened was that the people of fitnah began to exchange letters among themselves. When they saw their numbers growing, they agreed to meet near Madīnah in Shawwāl of the year 35 AH at the site of the pilgrims. The people of Egypt left in four groups, each led by one of four commanders. The least said they were six hundred, while the most claimed there were a thousand. They did not dare inform the people that they were heading for war; rather, they left as if they were pilgrims, with the Jewish man (Ibn Saba') among them. The people of Kūfah left in numbers similar to the Egyptians, as did the people of Baṣrah. When they got close to Madīnah, they began implementing the next stage of their plan. They had agreed to send two of their men to gather information about Madīnah and learn about its people's situation. The two men met the wives of the Prophet, peace be upon him, 'Alī, Ṭalḥah, and al-Zubayr, and said: "We have come to ask 'Uthmān to relieve some of our governors." They requested permission to let their companions enter, but the companions refused. 'Alī, may Allah be pleased with him, said: "I do not advise you to approach 'Uthmān. If you refuse, then the sword will be unsheathed." Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī (4/349–350), narrated by Sayf ibn 'Umar.

The people pretended to leave but secretly had other plans. When the news reached the people of Madīnah that the people of fitnah had turned away, the people calmed down. But that night, the people of fitnah unexpectedly entered Madīnah from every direction, gathering in the streets and shouting takbīr. 'Alī ibn Abī Ṭālib, may Allah be pleased with him, came and asked: "What is the matter with you? Why have you returned?" Al-Ghafqī replied: "'Uthmān betrayed us." 'Alī asked: "How?" He said: "We apprehended a messenger carrying a letter from 'Uthmān ordering the governors to kill us." 'Alī then said to the people of Kūfah and Baṣrah: "How do you know what happened to the people of Egypt, given that you traveled through several stages and then turned toward us? This, by Allah, is a matter planned in Madīnah." The letter that was forged in 'Uthmān's name became the excuse they used to justify shedding his blood and besieging him in his house until they killed him, may Allah be pleased with him.

Despite this, the rebels made their goals clear, saying: "Place him wherever you wish, we have no need for this man; let him leave us, and we will avoid him." Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī (4/351), narrated by Sayf ibn 'Umar.

Furthermore, there is evidence that this letter was forged. It was not the only forged letter attributed to 'Uthmān. 'Ā'ishah, may Allah be pleased with her, was accused of writing to the people urging them to revolt against 'Uthmān, but she denied it. She said: "By Him in whom the believers believe and the disbelievers disbelieve, I did not write a single letter to them." al-Bidāyah wa al-Nihāyah (7/195), and see what al-Ṭabarī narrated about the disapproval of the senior companions regarding these forged letters in the most authentic narrations (4/355).

What was that hidden hand that was writing behind the scenes to cause division among the Muslims, placing forged letters on the lips of the companions and orchestrating the plot of the letter sent to 'Uthmān's governor in Egypt? Who took advantage of these events to incite fitnah if not that evil Jew and his followers? They were the ones who instigated the fitnah.

We stopped earlier at the point where the Egyptian delegation returned after claiming that they had captured a messenger from 'Uthmān to his governor in Egypt ordering him to kill them, and we understood that this letter was not the only one forged on 'Uthmān. The truth behind the hand that forged and planned has become clear. Today, if Allah wills, we will continue the topic we started.

At this point, 'Uthmān consulted the senior companions about relinquishing the caliphate in order to calm the fitnah. Al-Mughīrah ibn al-Akhnas advised him to abdicate to avoid being killed by the rebels. 'Uthmān asked Ibn 'Umar for his opinion about al-Mughīrah's advice, and he told him: "I do not see that you should abdicate the shirt that Allah clothed you in, for this would set a precedent. Whenever a people dislike their ruler or leader, they would kill him." *Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd* (3/66), with a sound chain of narration, and *Tārīkh Khalīfah* (p.170), with a good chain of narration.

There are some narrations that suggest that 'Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, sent messages to the provinces asking for help after the siege and pressure on him intensified. However, this report is not correct, as the approach of 'Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, was patience and refraining from fighting, in accordance with the advice of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. This is based on the narration of 'Ā'ishah, may Allah be pleased with her, as reported by Ibn Abī 'Āsim in *al-Sunnah* (2/561), where she said: "When the day of the siege came, 'Uthmān was asked: 'Why don't you fight?' He replied: 'I made a covenant with the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, a covenant that I will adhere to with patience.'" 'Ā'ishah said: "We believed that the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, had entrusted him with this matter regarding what happens to him."

Therefore, 'Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, prioritized the welfare of the people. When Mu'āwiyah suggested sending an army to stay between the people of Madīnah to assist in case any harm came to the city or him, 'Uthmān replied: "I do not want to burden the neighbors of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, by sending soldiers to stay with them and put pressure on the people of Hijrah and Anṣār." Mu'āwiyah then said: "By Allah, O Commander of the Believers, either you will be killed or you will be fought against." 'Uthmān replied: "Allah is sufficient for me, and He is the best disposer of affairs." *Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī* (4/345). And then 'Uthmān was besieged in his house.

Ibn Khaldūn said: "At the beginning, the caliphate was governed by religion, and each person in it was motivated by their faith, which they prioritized over worldly matters, even if it led to their own destruction rather than that of the entire community. When 'Uthmān was besieged in his house, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, 'Abd Allāh ibn 'Umar, 'Abd Allāh ibn Ja'far, and others came to defend him, but he refused. He prevented the drawing of swords between the Muslims, fearing division and to preserve the unity that would ensure the survival of the community, even if it meant his death." *Muqaddimah Ibn Khaldūn* (p. 207-208).

Alongside his patience and seeking reward, and in order to preserve the unity of the ummah from fragmentation and destruction, 'Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, took another,

even firmer stand, which was refusing to comply with the demands of those who sought his abdication from the caliphate. Had he complied with their wishes, it would have set a precedent whereby whenever a group disliked their ruler, they would remove him. Undoubtedly, this stance by ‘Uthmān was the most significant and strongest action he could take, as he resorted to the lesser of two evils and the lighter of two harms in order to uphold the system of the caliphate.”

The rebels demanded three things from him, as mentioned in al-Ṭabaqāt by Ibn Sa‘d (3/72-73). ‘Uthmān asked al-Ashtar: “What do the people want from me?” He replied: “Three things, and you must comply with one of them.” ‘Uthmān asked: “What are they?” He said: “They offer you the choice between renouncing the caliphate for them, saying ‘This is your matter, choose who you want,’ or they want you to punish yourself. If you refuse both of these, then they will kill you.” ‘Uthmān replied: “Is there no alternative?” Al-Ashtar replied: “No, there is no alternative.” ‘Uthmān then said: “As for relinquishing the caliphate, by Allah, I would rather offer my neck to be struck than to take away a part of the Ummah of Muhammad, peace be upon him, from one another. As for punishing myself, by Allah, I know that my companion in front of me has been punished, and nothing of punishment is due. As for being killed, by Allah, if you kill me, you will never be united again after me, you will never pray together after me, and you will never fight an enemy together after me.”

Thus, ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, defended himself against the siege by saying: “If you find in the Book of Allah – and in another narration – the right to put my legs in chains, then put them in chains.” Tārīkh Khalīfah (p.171), and Ahmad in Fadā’il al-Ṣaḥābah (1/492), the editor said: “The chain of narration is authentic,” and see: al-Ṭabaqāt (3/69-70) with a similar wording.

Ahmad in Fadā’il al-Ṣaḥābah (1/464), in the Musnad (1/63), and al-Tirmidhī in al-Sunan (4/460–461), Ibn Mājah in al-Sunan (2/847), and Abū Dāwūd in al-Sunan (4/640–641) with a good chain of narration narrated that ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, went to the people besieging him and said: “Why are you killing me? I heard the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, say: ‘It is not lawful to shed the blood of a Muslim except in three cases: a man who commits adultery after being married and he is to be stoned, or a man who kills intentionally and he is to be executed, or a man who apostatizes after his Islam and he is to be killed.’ By Allah, I never committed adultery in ignorance or in Islam, nor did I kill anyone to be avenged for it, nor did I apostatize since my Islam. I bear witness that there is no god but Allah, and Muhammad is His servant and Messenger. So, why are you killing me?”

It has been confirmed that ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, took a clear and decisive stance of non-resistance, and he made it mandatory for the companions. He said: “I command everyone who sees it as obligatory to hear and obey, to stop using their hands and weapons.” Thus, al-Ḥasan, al-Ḥusayn, ‘Abd Allāh ibn ‘Umar left, and ‘Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr insisted on staying, along with Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam. When Ibn al-Zubayr asked him to fight the rebels, ‘Uthmān replied: “No, by Allah, I will never fight them.” Tārīkh Khalīfah (p. 173-174), Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah (15/204), and Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa‘d (3/70), all with authentic chains of narration.

Among those who wanted to fight in defense of ‘Uthmān was the companion Abū Hurayrah, who had strapped on his sword. However, ‘Uthmān did not permit him, saying: “O Abū

Hurayrah, would you like to kill all the people along with me?" He replied: "No." 'Uthmān said: "By Allah, if you fight even one man, it will be as if you have killed all the people." Abū Hurayrah said: "So I returned and did not fight." Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd (3/70), Tārīkh Khalīfah (p.173), and their chains of narration are authentic.

The siege on him continued, may Allah be pleased with him, to the point where they even prevented him from water. The news reached the mothers of the believers, and Umm Ḥabībah, may Allah be pleased with her, who was related to 'Uthmān, took water and hid it under her cloak, then mounted a mule and headed towards 'Uthmān's house. A conversation took place between her and the rebels, and al-Ashtar said: "You are lying; you have water with you," and he lifted her cloak and saw the water, and he became angry and split the water. Kinanah, the freed slave of Ṣafiyyah, said: "I was leading Ṣafiyyah to defend 'Uthmān when she met al-Ashtar, who struck the face of her mule, causing it to swerve." She said: "Turn me back, and do not let this dog disgrace me." al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr by al-Bukhārī (7/237), Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd (8/128) with an authentic chain, and also al-Ṭabarī (4/385–386).

In a narration from Imam Ahmad in Fadā'il al-Ṣaḥābah through al-Ḥasan al-Baṣrī, he said: "When the situation worsened on the day of the siege, they asked: 'Who is it?' They sent for Umm Ḥabībah, and she was brought on a white mule, covered with a cloak. When she approached the door, they asked: 'Who is this?' They were told: 'It is Umm Ḥabībah.' They said: 'By Allah, she will not enter.' And they sent her back." Fadā'il al-Ṣaḥābah (1/492), with the editor confirming the authenticity of the chain.

Some skirmishes occurred between the young companions and the rebels, in which some companions like al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī were wounded. This is corroborated by what Ibn 'Abd al-Barr mentioned in Al-Isti'āb (3/1387), and al-Bukhārī in al-Tārīkh al-Kabīr (7/237), from Kinanah, the freed slave of Ṣafiyyah bint Ḥayy ibn Akhtab, who said: "I witnessed the killing of 'Uthmān. Four young men from Quraysh, covered in blood, were brought out from his house, carrying those who defended him: al-Ḥasan ibn 'Alī, 'Abd Allāh ibn al-Zubayr, Muḥammad ibn Ḥatīb, and Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam."

Weak narrations also indicate that 'Uthmān, while besieged in his house, sent a request to 'Alī asking for his help. 'Alī responded to his request but was unable to reach the house due to the rebels surrounding it. 'Alī then addressed the rebels: "O people, what you are doing does not resemble the actions of the believers nor the disbelievers. Do not prevent this man from water or food, for even the Romans and the Persians capture and feed and water their prisoners." However, he was unable to do anything. He then removed his black turban, threw it to 'Uthmān's messenger, who took it to 'Uthmān, and 'Uthmān knew that 'Alī had tried to help but could not." Muṣannaf Ibn Abī Shaybah (15/209) with a broken chain, Ṭabaqāt Ibn Sa'd (3/68–69) with a broken chain, another broken chain with al-Ḥabīb ibn Abī Thābit's ta'dīl, and al-Ṭabarī (4/386), see 'Aṣr al-Khilāfah al-Rāshidah by Akrimah al-'Umarī (p.427).

The Day of the Siege... The siege on 'Uthmān continued for many days, with some historians estimating it lasted from the end of Dhū al-Qa'dah to the 12th of Dhū al-Ḥijjah in the year 35 AH. During this time, 'Uthmān displayed immense courage and self-restraint despite the harsh conditions and the siege. He frequently appeared before the besiegers and addressed them, reminding them of his actions, hoping they would soften, but they did not.

One day, ‘Uthmān appeared before the crowd after calling them to gather around his house to speak with them. Al-Tirmidhī narrated:

Al-Nasā’ī narrated through Thumāmah ibn Ḥazn al-Qushayrī, who said: “I witnessed the siege of ‘Uthmān when he appeared before them and said: ‘I ask you by Allah and Islam: Do you not know that when the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) came to Medina, there was no water there except for the well of Rumah, and he said, “Who will buy the well of Rumah, so that his bucket will be like the buckets of the Muslims? It will be better for him in Paradise?” I purchased it from my own wealth.’ They said: ‘Yes, by Allah.’ Al-Bukhārī added: ‘Do you not know that the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: “Whoever equips the army of al-‘Usrah will have Paradise,” and I equipped it?’ They said: ‘Yes, by Allah.’ Al-Tirmidhī added through Abū Ishāq: ‘Do you not know that when Ḥirā’ shook, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: “Stand firm, Ḥirā’! For there is nothing upon you except a Prophet, a Ṣiddīq, or a martyr?” They said: “Yes.” And do you not know that when the mosque became cramped, the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said: “Who will buy the piece of land belonging to the family of so-and-so and expand the mosque? It will be better for him in Paradise.” I purchased it from my own wealth. And now today, you prevent me from praying in it?’ They said: ‘Yes.’ And in al-Dārquṭnī, he added: ‘Do you not know that the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) married me his two daughters, one after the other, and was pleased with me and praised me?’ They said: ‘Yes.’ And in al-Ḥākim, he said to Ṭalḥah: ‘Do you remember when the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: “‘Uthmān is my companion in Paradise?”’ He said: ‘Yes.’” Sunan al-Tirmidhī (5/627), al-Nasā’ī (6/233–236), al-Dārquṭnī (4/197), al-Mustadrak (3/97), and Faṭḥ al-Bārī (5/477–479).

Abū Hurayrah, may Allah be pleased with him, said to those who besieged ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, on the day of the siege: “I heard the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) say: ‘You will encounter fitnah and disagreements after me, or he said: disagreements and fitnah.’ Someone from the people asked: ‘Who should we follow, O Messenger of Allah?’ He said: ‘Follow the trustworthy one and his companions,’ and he was pointing to ‘Uthmān.” Fadā’il al-Ṣaḥābah by Imām Aḥmad (450–451), and the editor confirmed the authenticity of the chain.

‘Ā’ishah, may Allah be pleased with her, said: “The Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) said during his illness: ‘I wish that some of my companions were here.’ We said: ‘O Messenger of Allah, shall we not call for Abū Bakr?’ He remained silent. We said: ‘Shall we not call for ‘Umar?’ He remained silent. We said: ‘Shall we not call for ‘Uthmān?’ He said: ‘Yes.’ So, he came and was alone with him. The Prophet (peace be upon him) spoke with him, and ‘Uthmān’s face changed.” Sahīḥ Sunan Ibn Mājah (1/25), and al-Albānī confirmed the authenticity of the chain.

‘Ā’ishah, may Allah be pleased with her, also said: “When it was the day of the siege, ‘Uthmān was told: ‘Will you not fight?’ He said: ‘I made a pledge to the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) on a promise, and I will be patient with it.’ ‘Ā’ishah said: ‘We used to think that the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) had made a promise to him concerning his situation.’” Kitāb al-Sunnah by Ibn Abī ‘Āsim (2/561), and al-Albānī confirmed the authenticity of the chain.

The rebels, during the siege of ‘Uthmān in his house and preventing him from leading the prayer for the people, were the ones leading the prayer. The one who prayed with the people was al-Ghafakī ibn Ḥarb.

Al-Bukhārī narrated in his Ṣaḥīḥ from al-Zuhrī through Ḥumāid ibn ‘Abd al-Raḥmān from ‘Abd Allāh ibn Khiyār: “He entered upon ‘Uthmān while he was besieged and said: ‘You are the Imam of the general people, and what has befallen you, we see. Now we have an Imam of fitnah praying with us, and we feel uneasy.’ He said: ‘The prayer is the best thing the people can do. If the people do well, do well with them, and if they do poorly, avoid their mistakes.’” Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī with Fath al-Bārī (2/221).

The night of ‘Uthmān’s martyrdom...

Before his death, ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, saw in a dream that his death was near and submitted to the will of Allah. Al-Ḥākim narrated with an authentic chain from Ibn ‘Umar, may Allah be pleased with him, that ‘Uthmān began speaking to the people, saying: ‘I saw the Messenger of Allah (peace be upon him) in a dream, and he said: “O ‘Uthmān! Break your fast with us.” So, he began fasting and was killed on that very day.’ Al-Mustadrak (3/99), and the editor said this is a sound narration, and al-Dhahabī agreed. It was also narrated by Aḥmad in Fadā’il al-Ṣaḥābah from another chain (1/497), and the editor said its chain is good. Another version was reported by Ibn Ḥajar in al-Maṭālib al-‘Āliyah (4/291), and the editor said: “al-Būṣīrī narrated it from al-Bazzār and Abū Ya‘lā and al-Ḥākim and said: ‘The chain is authentic.’” Al-Haythamī mentioned it in al-Majma‘ (7/232) and confirmed its authenticity in al-Mustadrak (3/103), and Ibn Sa‘d mentioned it in Ṭabaqāt (3/75).

Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt narrated in his Tārīkh (p. 174) with a chain of trustworthy narrators from Abū Sa‘īd, the freed slave of Abū Asīd, who said: “‘Uthmān opened the door and placed the Qur’an between his hands. A man entered and said: ‘Between me and you is the Book of Allah.’ ‘Uthmān left him and went out. Then another man entered and said: ‘Between me and you is the Book of Allah.’ ‘Uthmān reached for his sword, and the man tried to block the blow with his hand, which he cut off. I do not know whether the hand was severed or just injured. He swore, ‘By Allah, this is the first hand that wrote the Muṣḥaf.’”

This is the narration about how the rebels entered upon ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, and their swords stained his pure blood. Al-Ghafakī took a piece of iron and struck ‘Uthmān with it, kicking the Qur’an with his foot, causing it to fly and then return to ‘Uthmān’s chest. Blood poured out, and it fell on the verse: {Fasayukfikum Allāh} [Al-Baqarah / 138]. At this moment, Nā’ila, ‘Uthmān’s wife, tried to protect him, but when Sudan raised his sword to strike ‘Uthmān, she put her hand in the way, and he severed her fingers. She fled, crying for help, and he struck her in the back. Then Sudan struck ‘Uthmān on his shoulder, injuring it. Then he struck him with a dagger, delivering nine blows, saying: ‘Three for the sake of Allah, and six for what is in their hearts.’ Then Qutayrah stood over him with a sword, leaned on the sword, and thrust it into his chest. Finally, the most wicked of them came and jumped on ‘Uthmān’s chest, breaking his ribs. At that moment, ‘Uthmān’s servants tried to defend him and managed to kill both Sudan and Qutayrah. However, the rebels killed all the servants and left their bodies inside the house. Later, a group of the Companions went to his house, carried his body, and buried him at night in Ḥaṣh Kawkab, a cemetery that had been

purchased by ‘Uthmān. It was behind al-Baqī‘, and he was not buried in al-Baqī‘ due to the prohibition from the rebels. Later, during the reign of Mu‘āwiyah, al-Baqī‘ was expanded, and ‘Uthmān’s grave was moved into it.” Mu‘jam al-Buldan (2/262), see this report in al-Ṭabarī (4/412), and look for the report about his blood on the Qur’an in Fadā’il al-Ṣaḥābah by Aḥmad (1/470–473) with an authentic chain, Tārīkh Khalīfah (p. 188–190), al-Maṭālib al-‘Āliyah (4/286), and Mawārid al-Zam‘ān (7/128).

It is also revealed what the rebels were truly after, as Ibn Kathīr mentions in al-Bidāyah (7/189): “After the murder of ‘Uthmān, the Khawārij called to seize the Bayt al-Māl. The treasurers of the Bayt al-Māl heard them and said: ‘O people, save yourselves! For these people did not speak the truth when they said their goal was to establish the truth, command good, and forbid evil, and other things they claimed they were fighting for. They lied; their real goal was the world.’ They took the money from the treasury and then looted ‘Uthmān’s house, taking whatever they could, even to the point that one of them took the cloak from Nā’ila.” Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī (4/391).

This was the trial that the Prophet (peace be upon him) foretold, in which ‘Uthmān would be unjustly killed. Al-Bukhārī narrated in his Ṣaḥīḥ from Abū Mūsā al-Ash‘arī, may Allah be pleased with him, that the Prophet (peace be upon him) entered a garden, and a man came seeking permission to enter. The Prophet (peace be upon him) said: “Let him in and give him the glad tidings of Paradise.” It was Abū Bakr. Then another man came, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) said: “Let him in and give him the glad tidings of Paradise.” It was ‘Umar. Then another man came, and the Prophet (peace be upon him) hesitated for a moment, then said: “Let him in and give him the glad tidings of Paradise, but on a trial that will befall him.” It was ‘Uthmān.” Ibn Ḥajar commented on this, saying: “The Prophet (peace be upon him) referred to the trial mentioned as the one that would befall ‘Uthmān at the end of his caliphate on the day of the siege.” Faḥ al-Bārī (7/38) and (13/55). This narration is found in Ṣaḥīḥ al-Bukhārī (7/65) and was also narrated by Imam Muslim in his Ṣaḥīḥ (6162) and (6164).

Benefit: Ibn Baṭṭāl said: “‘Uthmān was singled out for mention about the trial, although ‘Umar was also killed, because ‘Umar was not tested in the same way that ‘Uthmān was. ‘Uthmān faced the oppression of those who demanded that he abdicate the caliphate due to accusations of injustice and tyranny, while he denied all accusations and apologized for anything they brought against him. Then, they stormed his house and violated the privacy of his family, and all of this occurred in addition to his murder.” Faḥ al-Bārī (13/55).

There are varying reports about who killed him, but this is not important because a participant is like the killer, and the one who causes harm is like the one who directly does it. What matters is identifying his killers. They were described as mobsters from various towns, as al-Zubayr, may Allah be pleased with him, described them, and as A‘ishah, may Allah be pleased with her, said they were people who divided the tribes. According to Ibn Sa‘d in his Ṭabaqāt (3/71), they were the scum of society united in evil. They were Khawārij, corrupt, misguided, and rebellious, as described by Ibn Taymīyah in Minhāj al-Sunnah (6/297).

A reader may ask or say: How could ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, be killed while there were many prominent Companions of the Prophet, may Allah be pleased with them, in Medina? This is a question that Ibn Kathīr raised in al-Bidāyah wa’l-Nihāyah (7/197-198),

and he answered it. He was joined by al-Mālaqī in al-Tamhīd wa'l-Bayān (p. 131-132) in providing the following explanation:

First: Many of the Companions, or even all of them, did not think that the situation would escalate to the point of 'Uthmān's murder. The Khawārij, those who besieged him, did not initially intend to kill him. Rather, they requested one of three things: either for him to remove himself from the caliphate, or to hand over Marwān ibn al-Ḥakam to them, or to kill him. They hoped that he would hand over Marwān, as they accused him of being the one who wrote the letter on behalf of 'Uthmān, ordering the governor of Egypt to kill them. However, this claim was not substantiated, and there is no authentic evidence for it. Alternatively, they wanted him to step down and relieve himself from this difficult predicament. As for the killing, no one thought that it would occur, nor that they would dare to go that far.

Second: The Companions defended 'Uthmān, but when the siege intensified, 'Uthmān urged the people to cease fighting in order to preserve the blood of the Muslims. Thus, they complied, and the besiegers were able to do what they intended.

Third: The Khawārij took advantage of the absence of many people from Medina due to the Hajj season and their deployment to various frontiers and provinces. Perhaps there were not enough residents in Medina to match the nearly two thousand Khawārij fighters.

Fourth: The senior Companions had sent their sons to 'Uthmān's house to protect him, but 'Uthmān knew that the number of his supporters was small and that those seeking to kill him were many. If he had allowed them to fight, he feared that many of the Prophet's Companions would be killed as a result, so he chose to protect them out of compassion for them. A shepherd must protect his flock as much as possible, and 'Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, as their shepherd, acted to protect them. However, he knew that his death was inevitable, so he spared them by sacrificing himself to preserve the lives of the Muslims.

Fifth: When 'Uthmān realized that it was a fitnah, and that once the sword was drawn in a fitnah, it was likely that even those who did not deserve to be killed would be slain, he chose not to allow his companions to draw their swords. He did so out of compassion for them, and to prevent wealth from being lost and women's honor from being violated in the fitnah.

Sixth: It is possible that 'Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, endured the situation to ensure that the Companions would witness those who wronged him, disobeyed his orders, and unjustly shed his blood. For the believers are the witnesses of Allah on Earth.

Imam Ibn Taymiyyah said in Minhāj al-Sunnah (6/286): "It is well-known and transmitted that 'Uthmān was one of the most patient people when it came to bloodshed, and he was the most forbearing toward those who insulted his honor and those who conspired against his life. He was besieged and those who sought to kill him were known to have this intention. Muslims came to him to support him, advising him to fight them. He ordered the people to refrain from fighting and commanded those who obeyed him not to fight them. They suggested that he go to Mecca, but he said, 'I will not be among those who are killed in the sacred sanctuary.' They suggested that he go to Syria, but he said, 'I will not leave the place of migration.' They said to him, 'Then fight them,' and he replied, 'I will not be the first to draw the sword after Muhammad (peace be upon him) in his ummah.'"

So, ‘Uthmān’s patience until his death was one of his greatest virtues in the eyes of the Muslims.

In line with this, it is appropriate to mention the words of Imam al-Ajurri in his book al-Sharī‘ah (4/1981-1983) about the stance of the Companions in Medina during the siege by the hypocrites.

Al-Ajurri said: “If someone says: ‘They knew he was wronged and was about to be killed, so they should have fought to protect him, even if he forbade them,’ we respond: ‘You have spoken without discernment.’ If they ask: ‘Why?’ we answer: ‘Because the people were obedient to him, and Allah guided them to the correct course of action. They did what was required of them by speaking out against the wrong, using their words and tongues, and offering their lives to support him according to their ability. When ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, forbade them from helping him, they knew that their duty was to listen and obey him. If they had opposed him, they would have been in the wrong, and the truth was with whatever ‘Uthmān saw as best for them.’ If they then ask, ‘Why did ‘Uthmān forbid them from helping him if he was wronged, knowing that fighting for him would be enjoining what is right and forbidding what is wrong?’ we reply: ‘This too is an oversight on your part.’ They ask: ‘How?’ We respond: ‘His forbidding them from fighting on his behalf can be understood in several ways, all of which are commendable: ...”

One explanation is that he knew he was going to be killed unjustly, without a doubt, because the Prophet, peace be upon him, had informed him: “You will be killed unjustly, so be patient.” He replied, “I will be patient.” When they surrounded him, he knew that he was going to be killed and that what the Prophet had said to him was true. It had to happen. Then he remembered that he had promised himself patience, so he was patient as he had promised. He understood that anyone who sought to avenge themselves or protect themselves would not be considered patient, as he had made a promise to be patient. This is one reason.

Another reason is that he knew the number of his supporters was small, while those wanting to kill him were many. If he had allowed them to fight, he feared that many of the Prophet’s companions would be killed because of him. Therefore, he protected them by sacrificing himself, out of compassion for them. He was a shepherd, and a shepherd has a duty to protect his flock as much as possible. Yet, he knew he was going to be killed, so he shielded them with his own self. This is another reason.

Another reason is that he knew it was a fitnah (trial), and in a fitnah, when the sword is drawn, one cannot be sure that those who do not deserve to be killed will not be killed. So, he did not choose to have his companions draw their swords in the fitnah, and this was out of compassion for them. He protected them from all of this.

Another reason is that it is possible that he withheld from seeking victory in order for the companions to be witnesses against those who wronged him, disobeyed his orders, and unjustly shed his blood. This is because the believers are the witnesses of Allah on His earth. Even so, he did not want to shed the blood of any Muslim because of him, nor did he want to leave the Prophet’s ummah by spilling the blood of a Muslim. This is what he said, may Allah be pleased with him. Therefore, ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, was

correct, excused, and wise in his actions, and the Companions were excused. The one who killed him was wretched.

From this, we know that the approach of ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, during the fitnah and his stance with the hypocrites (a term used by the Prophet, peace be upon him, for those who rebelled against ‘Uthmān, as stated in the hadith: “... the hypocrites wanted you to step down ...” — the full reference was provided) was not dictated by the events or the pressures of reality, but rather, it was a method that emanated from the light of prophecy. The Prophet, peace be upon him, had ordered him to be patient, to seek reward, and not to fight until Allah’s decree was fulfilled. ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, fulfilled his promise to the Prophet throughout his caliphate until he was martyred, his pure and sacred blood spilled, answering the Prophet’s call to break his fast with him. See: *Shahādah ‘Uthmān* by Khalid al-Ghaith (p. 116).

Imam Ahmad, in *al-Fadā’il al-Ṣahābah* (1/496-497), narrated with a good chain of transmission from Muslim Abu Sa‘īd, the freed slave of ‘Uthmān, that ‘Uthmān ibn ‘Affān freed twenty slaves and tied his loincloth around himself (so that his private parts would not be exposed when he was killed). He had never worn it either in pre-Islamic times or during Islam. He said, “I saw the Prophet, peace be upon him, in my sleep last night, and I saw Abu Bakr and ‘Umar, and they said to me, ‘Be patient, for you will break your fast with us tomorrow.’ Then he called for a Qur’ān and spread it before him. He was killed while it was in front of him.”

The fitnah of ‘Uthmān’s martyrdom is considered one of the most critical events in the history of the Islamic state during the era of the Rashidun caliphate. It caused significant division and discord within the Muslim ummah, which nearly led to its destruction. This led to further internal fitnah, such as the Battle of the Camel, the Battle of Ṣiffīn, and the Battle of Nahrawan. Its effects continued, manifesting in the Khawārij and the Shia who opposed the Umayyad state, especially in the early days of the Abbasid state. In fact, the major divisions caused by this fitnah can be seen as having an impact on the ummah to this day.

The martyrdom of ‘Uthmān, may Allah be pleased with him, occurred on a Friday morning, the 12th of Dhul-Hijjah, in the 35th year of the Hijrah. He was buried that night, between Maghrib and ‘Ishā’, in Ḥaṣh Kawkab, east of al-Baqī’. He was 82 years old at the time, according to the most authentic and well-known reports. May Allah have mercy on ‘Uthmān and be pleased with him. See: Ibn Sa‘d (3/77-78), Khalīfah ibn Khayyāt (p. 176), al-Ṭabarī (4/415-416), al-Musnad (2/10), al-Dhahabī in *Tārīkh al-Islām*, ‘Ahd al-Khulafā’ al-Rāshidīn (p. 481), al-Bidāyah wa’l-Nihāyah by Ibn Kathīr (7/190), and al-Isti‘āb by Ibn ‘Abd al-Barr (3/1044).

(Regarding the stance on what transpired among the Companions).

I say, and with Allah’s help: Know, may Allah have mercy on me and you, that delving into what occurred among the Companions does not bring the servant closer to Allah. They have met their Lord, and He knows best what occurred between them. If this matter does not bring you closer to Allah and may instead lead you to the Hellfire while you are unaware, then it is better to avoid it—except in one case, and this case will be explained later.

The meaning of refraining from discussing what occurred among the Companions is to avoid indulging in the details of the wars and disagreements among them, or spreading these details among the general public, or belittling one group and favoring another.

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said in Majmū‘ al-Fatāwā (3/406): “Similarly, we believe in refraining from discussing what occurred among them, and we know that some of what has been transmitted about it is false. They were striving to find the truth; either they were correct and will receive two rewards, or they will be rewarded for their good deeds and their mistakes will be forgiven, and what wrongs they committed will be pardoned. They have already received Allah’s best reward. Indeed, Allah forgives them, either through repentance, wiping out sins with good deeds, or by expiating calamities.”

The disagreements among them arose because they, may Allah be pleased with them, were seeking the truth and defending it. Their ijtihād (judgments) differed, but they were considered just and pleasing to Allah. Therefore, the methodology of Ahl al-Sunnah wa’l-Jamā‘ah is to guard the tongue from what occurred among them, to speak well of them, to interpret their actions charitably, and to make excuses for the ones who were mistaken, as their intentions are with Allah. They have passed on, and we seek to be pleased with them all, to ask for mercy for them, and to ensure our hearts are free from malice towards them.

Ibn Qudāmah al-Maqdisī said in al-Luma‘a (p. 175): “It is from the Sunnah to love the companions of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, to speak of their virtues, to ask for mercy for them, and to seek forgiveness for them, to refrain from mentioning their faults or what occurred between them, to believe in their excellence, and to acknowledge their precedence. Allah, the Most High, said: ‘And those who came after them say, ‘Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith, and do not make in our hearts any resentment toward those who have believed’ [Al-Hashr, 59:10]. And He also said: ‘Muhammad is the messenger of Allah, and those with him are firm against the disbelievers and merciful among themselves’ [Al-Fath, 48:29]. The Prophet, peace be upon him, said: ‘Do not curse my companions, for if one of you were to spend the like of Mount Uhud in gold, it would not equal a handful of one of them, nor even half of it.’ (Bukhari with al-Fath 7/25; Muslim, hadith no. 6435).”

Imam al-Dhahabī, may Allah have mercy on him, said in Siyar A‘lām al-Nubalā’ (10/92-93): “It is well established to refrain from much of what occurred among them, and their fighting, may Allah be pleased with them all, still passes by us in records, books, and collections. But much of this is interrupted, weak, and some of it is lies. It should be disregarded, hidden, or even erased to purify the hearts, to focus on loving the Companions, and to pray for them. Concealing this is obligatory, both for the general public and individual scholars... He then said: As for what the people of innovation have transmitted in their books about this, we do not pay attention to it, for most of it is falsehood, lies, and slander.”

The virtue of companionship, even if only for a moment, is unparalleled by any deed, and its rank cannot be attained by any means. Virtues are not taken by analogy.

Ibn Asākir mentioned in his Tārīkh (59/141) in the biography of Mu‘āwiyah, may Allah be pleased with him, from the chain of Ibn Mandah, then from the chain of Abū al-Qāsim, the nephew of Abū Zur‘ah al-Rāzī, that a man came to my uncle and said to him, “I hate Mu‘āwiyah.” He asked him, “Why?” The man replied, “Because he fought ‘Alī without right.”

Abū Zur‘ah said to him: “The Lord of Mu‘āwiyah is a merciful Lord, and the opponent of Mu‘āwiyah is an honorable opponent. What concern is it of yours between them?”

Al-Ājurī, may Allah have mercy on him, said in al-Sharī‘ah (5/2485-2491), in the chapter on refraining from discussing what occurred among the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and may Allah’s mercy be upon them all: “Whoever reflects on the virtues of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and the virtues of his family, may Allah be pleased with them all, should love them, pray for them, seek forgiveness for them, and ask Allah, the Generous, to grant them intercession—through prayer, mercy, forgiveness, and seeking their pleasure. He should thank Allah, the Most High, for enabling him to do so, and he should not mention what occurred between them or delve into it. If an ignorant person, led astray, comes and says: ‘Why did so-and-so fight such-and-such? Why did so-and-so kill such-and-such?’, we should reply: ‘We have no need to speak of this, as it neither benefits us nor harms us to know it.’”

If someone asks, “Why?”

It was said: Because these were trials witnessed by the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, and they were in them according to the knowledge that was revealed to them. They were more knowledgeable in interpreting them than others, and they were more rightly guided than those who came after them, for they are the people of Paradise, upon whom the Qur’an was revealed, who witnessed the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and fought with him. Allah, the Exalted, testified to their satisfaction, forgiveness, and great reward, and the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, testified that they were the best of generations. Therefore, they knew Allah better, His Messenger, the Qur’an, and the Sunnah. From them, knowledge is taken, and by their words, we live. By their rulings, we judge, and by their manners, we adopt conduct, and to them, we follow, and this is what we are commanded with.

If someone says: “What harm is there in knowing what happened between them and searching into it?”

It can be said: There is no doubt about this. The intellects of the people were greater than ours, and our intellects are much weaker. We cannot be certain that by investigating what happened among them, we will not deviate from the right path and fall behind the commands regarding them.

If someone asks: “And what are we commanded with concerning them?”

It can be said: We are commanded to seek forgiveness for them, to pray for mercy upon them, to love them, and to follow them. This is evident from the Book and the Sunnah, and the words of the Imams of the Muslims. We have no need to mention what happened between them. They accompanied the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and they married into his family, and he married into theirs. Through their companionship with him, Allah, the Most Generous, forgives them. Allah has promised them in His Book that He will never disgrace any of them. Allah, the Exalted, has described them in the Torah and the Gospel, giving them the most beautiful descriptions and attributes. Our Lord, the Generous, has informed us that He has accepted their repentance, and when He has accepted their repentance, He will never punish any of them. May Allah be pleased with them, and they

with Him: “These are the Party of Allah; indeed, the Party of Allah are the successful ones.” [Al-Mujādila, 58:22].

If someone says: “But my intention is to be knowledgeable about what occurred among them so that nothing that happened will be unknown to me because I love it and do not want to remain ignorant of it.”

It can be said: You are a seeker of trials, for you are searching for what harms you and does not benefit you. If you were to occupy yourself with fulfilling what Allah, the Exalted, has commanded of you in terms of worship, performing His obligatory acts and avoiding His prohibitions, that would be more fitting for you. And it can be said to him: Especially in our time, when so many false desires have become apparent—what would he say, may Allah have mercy on him, if he saw what is happening and being said in our time?

It can also be said to him: Occupy yourself with your sustenance, your clothing—where is it from? How do you acquire it? And where do you spend it? That is more appropriate for you.

It can also be said: We cannot be certain that by delving into and searching into what occurred among the people, your heart may tilt towards what is suitable for you to incline towards, and the devil may play with you, causing you to curse and despise those whom Allah has commanded you to love, seek forgiveness for, and follow. You may then deviate from the right path and take the path of falsehood.

If someone says: “Then mention to us from the Book, the Sunnah, and from the scholars of the Muslims who have passed, what indicates what you have said, so that we may turn our souls away from the desire to search into what occurred between the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them.”

It can be said: We have already mentioned some of what we have mentioned, which contains sufficient evidence for those who understand, and we will repeat some of what we have mentioned so that the believer who seeks guidance to the path of truth may wake up. Allah, the Exalted, says: “Muhammad is the Messenger of Allah, and those with him are firm against the disbelievers, merciful among themselves. You see them bowing and prostrating, seeking bounty from Allah and His pleasure. Their mark is on their faces from the trace of prostration. That is their description in the Torah, and their description in the Gospel is like a plant which produces its stalk, then strengthens it, and it grows thick and stands upon its own stem, delighting the sowers—so that He may enrage the disbelievers...” [Al-Fath, 48:29]. Then Allah promises them forgiveness and great reward.

Allah, the Exalted, says: “Allah has forgiven the Prophet, the Muhājirīn, and the Anṣār, those who followed him in the hour of difficulty...” [At-Tawbah, 9:117], the verse. Allah also says: “And the foremost among the Muhājirīn and the Anṣār and those who followed them with good conduct—Allah is pleased with them and they are pleased with Him...” [At-Tawbah, 9:100], and the verse continues. Allah, the Exalted, says: “The Day when Allah will not disgrace the Prophet and those who believed with him, their light will shine in front of them and to their right...” [At-Tahrīm, 66:8]. Allah also says: “You are the best nation...” [Aal-‘Imrān, 3:110]. Allah, the Exalted, says: “Indeed, Allah is pleased with the believers...” [Al-Fath, 48:18], and the verse continues.

Moreover, Allah, the Exalted, praised those who came after the Companions, who sought forgiveness for them and asked their Generous Lord not to place any ill feeling in their hearts for them. Allah praised them in the best of ways, saying: “And those who came after them... to His saying... full of compassion and mercy.” [Al-Hashr, 59:10]. The Prophet, peace be upon him, said: “The best of people are my generation, then those who come after them...”

They are followed by those who follow them. This was narrated by al-Bukhari with al-Fath (7/5), Muslim in hadith number (6419), and Ahmad in his Musnad (1/438). Ibn Mas’ud said: “Indeed, Allah, the Exalted, looked into the hearts of His servants and found the heart of Muhammad, peace be upon him, to be the best of hearts, so He chose him for Himself and sent him with His message. Then He looked into the hearts of His servants after the heart of Muhammad, peace be upon him, and found the hearts of his companions to be the best hearts among His servants—meaning, among those other than the Prophets and Messengers, as is well known. He made them the ministers of His Prophet, peace be upon him, to fight for His religion.” This was narrated by Ahmad in his Musnad (1/379) and al-Baghawi in his Sharh al-Sunnah (1/214-215), and it is a sound narration.

Then al-Ajuri, may Allah have mercy on him, said: It is said to those who have heard this from Allah, the Exalted, and from His Messenger, peace be upon him: If you are a servant who has been guided to good, you will take heed from what Allah, the Exalted, has admonished you with. However, if you are following your desires, I fear for you that you may be among those whom Allah, the Exalted, says about: “And who is more astray than one who follows his desire without guidance from Allah?” [Al-Qasas, 28:50]. You may be among those whom Allah, the Exalted, says about: “And if Allah had known any good in them, He would have made them hear, and if He had made them hear, they would have turned away, while they were avoiding.” [Al-Anfal, 8:23].

It is said to him: Whoever comes to the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, to criticize some of them, favor some over others, and insult some while praising others—such a person is a seeker of trials, and has fallen into the trial. It is incumbent upon him to love all of them, seek forgiveness for all of them, may Allah be pleased with them, and benefit from their love. We will add further clarification so that your heart may be at peace with all of them and leave the search and scrutiny regarding what occurred among them.

Then he, may Allah have mercy on him, presented a number of narrations that show the duty of action regarding the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. Among them, he narrated from Shihab ibn Khurash from al-Awam ibn Hushayb who said: “Mention the virtues of the companions of Muhammad, peace be upon him, and your hearts will be united upon them. Do not mention anything else, lest you stir up animosity towards them.” This was narrated by al-Khallal in his “Al-Sunnah” (p. 513) and its chain of narration is good. He also narrated from Abu Maysarah, who said: “I saw in a dream tents in gardens set up, and I asked: ‘Whose are these?’ They replied: ‘They belong to Dhū al-Kilā’ and his companions—those who fought with Mu’awiyah, may Allah be pleased with him.’ I then saw other tents in gardens and asked: ‘Whose are these?’ They replied: ‘They belong to Ammar and his companions.’ I said: ‘But some of them killed others!’ They replied: ‘Indeed, they found Allah, the Exalted, to be vast in forgiveness.’” The chain of narration is authentic to Abu Maysarah, and no one other than Imam al-Ajuri has narrated this, as the scholar has noted. See the book Al-Shari’ah (5/2493). He also mentioned that al-Hasan, may Allah have

mercy on him, was once in a gathering, and he mentioned the companions of Muhammad, peace be upon him, saying: "Those were the companions of Muhammad, peace be upon him; they were the purest of hearts in this nation, the deepest in knowledge, and the least in pretension. A people whom Allah chose to accompany His Prophet, peace be upon him, and to establish His religion. So, adopt their manners and ways, for by the Lord of the Ka'bah, they are upon the straight guidance." This was narrated by Abu Na'im in *Al-Hilya* (1/305-306) from al-Hasan from Ibn Umar, and al-Baghawi in his *Sharh al-Sunnah* (1/214) from Ibn Mas'ud.

What is apparent from the words of these scholars is the emphasis on this important principle, which is: Not to delve into what occurred between the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, as a form of entertainment, producing tapes and lectures, and presenting them among people of various levels. This is the mistake that Dr. Tariq Suwaydan, may Allah preserve him, has fallen into.

However, some scholars permitted discussing this issue only in one case: If an innovator or a false accuser appears who slanders the Companions with falsehood, it becomes obligatory to defend them with truth and justice, with the clarification that one should not defend some while insulting others among them. The defense must be for all of them, may Allah be pleased with them. Otherwise, one must remain silent and refrain from discussing what occurred among them. "The Rules for Preserving Islamic History," an article from *Al-Muslimoon* newspaper by Dr. Muhammad bin Abdullah al-Ghaban, Issue 656, page 8.

The issue of the dispute and disagreement among the Companions after the killing of Uthman, may Allah be pleased with him, should be viewed from two angles:

The first: The blame for that trial, in general, falls on the killers of Uthman. Because every Muslim killed by his brothers since Uthman's death is a sin upon those who killed him. They were the ones who opened the door to fitnah (trial), and everything that occurred afterward is their sin and burden. They were the direct cause of it, and they were the unjust, rebellious, and oppressive faction responsible for the deaths that occurred in the battles of Jamal and Siffin and the subsequent events, opinions, and positions that opened the door to division and disagreement among the Muslims.

The second angle: What happened among the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, during this trial should be interpreted as stemming from good intentions and differences in judgment and *ijtihad* (independent legal reasoning). It should also be seen as a result of error and correct judgment, but they were, in any case, striving in their efforts, and due to their sincerity in their *ijtihad*, they are rewarded whether they were correct or wrong. However, the reward for the correct one is twice that of the one who made an error, because each group had a viewpoint that they defended with good intentions. The disagreement among them was not due to competition for worldly gain, but was rather a result of each one's effort to apply the laws of Islam. (See *Tahqiq Mawaqif al-Sahabah fi al-Fitnah* 2/340-342, edited).

Ibn Mubarak was asked about the trial between Ali and Mu'awiyah, may Allah be pleased with them both, and he said: "A trial from which Allah has protected our swords, so let us protect our tongues from it." This means caution against making errors and judging any of them wrongly.

Al-Hasan al-Basri was asked about their fighting, and he said: "A battle witnessed by the companions of Muhammad, peace be upon him, while we were absent, they knew, and we were ignorant, they gathered, and we followed, they disagreed, and we stood still." (Al-Jami' Li-Ahkam al-Quran by al-Qurtubi, 8/322, in the commentary on Surah al-Hujurat).

Imam al-Nawawi, may Allah have mercy on him, says in his explanation of Sahih Muslim (18/219-220): "Know that the bloodshed that occurred among the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, does not fall under the threat in the hadith: 'When two Muslims meet with their swords, the killer and the killed are in the Fire.' The belief of Ahl al-Sunnah and the truth is to have a good opinion of them, to withhold from what occurred between them, and to interpret their fighting as a result of ijtihad, where each side believed itself to be right, and opposed the other thinking they were in error, so they fought to bring the matter back to Allah. Some of them were correct, and some were mistaken but excused for their mistake, because it was ijtihad, and the one who makes ijtihad and errs has no sin."

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah mentions in several places in Majmu' al-Fatawa (35/50, 54, 56, 69) the view of Ahl al-Sunnah on this issue, distancing the opinions of the innovators like the Khawarij, Rafidah, and Mu'tazilah, who made fighting a cause for either disbelief or sin. He says: "Ahl al-Sunnah and the Imams of religion do not believe that any of the Companions are infallible, but they can fall into sin. Allah forgives them through repentance, raising their ranks. The only infallible ones are the Prophets. As for the truthful ones, the martyrs, and the righteous, they are not infallible. This applies to confirmed sins. As for their ijtihad, they may be right or wrong. When they strive and are correct, they receive two rewards, and when they strive and make a mistake, they receive one reward for their effort. Most scholars distinguish between the Khawarij (the extremists) and the people of Jamal and Siffin, who are considered rebellious but interpreters, and this is what is passed down from the Companions and the majority of the scholars of Hadith, Fiqh, and the Imams."

Ibn Hajar says in Fath al-Bari (13/37): "Ahl al-Sunnah agree on the obligation of preventing the slandering of any of the Companions because of what occurred among them, even if we know who was right, as they only fought in those wars based on ijtihad. Allah forgives the one who makes a mistake in ijtihad, and it is established that such a person is rewarded once, while the correct one is rewarded twice."

Thus, we gather from the words of these scholars that the stance on what occurred among the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, is to withhold and not engage in it. This is also supported by a hadith narrated by al-Tabarani and others, where the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, said: "When my companions are mentioned, refrain from speaking." (See: Silsilat al-Sahihah 1/75).

Al-Munawi explains in Fayd al-Qadir (2/676) that the meaning of this hadith refers to "what occurred among them" – meaning, the wars and disputes among the Companions.

Al-Dhahabi says in Siyar A'lam al-Nubala (3/128): "By Allah, how would someone who grew up in a region where they rarely see anything but extreme love or excessive hatred find fairness and moderation? We thank Allah for the safety He granted us, as we live in a time where the truth has become clear from both sides, and we know the positions of each group, and we have gained insight, excused them, sought forgiveness for them, and loved them with moderation. We have also asked for mercy for the rebellious ones, who were mistaken

but their error is excused by their interpretation. And we say, as Allah has taught us: 'Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith, and do not place in our hearts any hatred for those who have believed.' We also are pleased with those who remained neutral between the two factions, like Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas, Ibn Umar, Muhammad ibn Maslamah, Sa'id ibn Zayd, and others. We disassociate ourselves from the Khawarij who fought against Ali."

They declared both factions as disbelievers.

These are brief excerpts from the beliefs of Ahl al-Sunnah wa'l-Jama'ah regarding the Companions, and these convictions and legal principles do not waver due to the false claims of the pessimists or the doubts raised by the doubters.

And if the honor of Muslims in general is protected in Islam, then the honor of the Companions, who are the people of virtue, precedence, and jihad, is more deserving of protection. Defending them is an act of devotion to Allah Almighty and an appreciation of their merits and jihad.

Finally, why this concern for the honor of the Companions, and why defend them?

I say: There is a hidden danger in cursing them or casting doubt on their justice, for they are the transmitters of the religion, and attacking them is a way to attack the religion itself.

One of the worst methodological and educational errors is teaching about the wars and conflicts that occurred between the Companions to school students, with all the distortions that accompany this, as well as the failure to properly teach students about the status of the Companions, their virtues, and their rights over the Muslim community. This results in a conflict in their minds between the natural image they have of the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him, and what they should be in terms of uprightness, and the image they receive from school. They cannot distinguish the truth from this nor fully understand it due to their young age and limited knowledge. Even if you try to clarify the correct picture to them, they are barely convinced, because the doubts that have been raised have already taken root in their minds.

Presenting such historical material to young students or the general public contradicts fundamental principles, such as the principle of "blocking the means" (Sadd al-Dhara'i), and the principle that "preventing harm takes precedence over bringing benefits" (Dar' al-Mafasid Muqaddam 'Ala Jalb al-Masaleh). It also contradicts educational principles, which require that nothing be presented to people that their minds cannot bear.

There is also evidence from the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, supporting this. Abdullah ibn Mas'ud said, as found in the introduction to Sahih Muslim (Hadith number 14): "You are not to tell a people a narration that they cannot comprehend except that it will become a trial for some of them." Al-Bukhari has a chapter in his Sahih: "Chapter on who gives knowledge to some people and not others out of fear that they will not understand." He quoted Ali ibn Abi Talib saying: "Speak to people according to their level of understanding. Do you want Allah and His Messenger to be disbelieved?" (Sahih al-Bukhari, Fath 1/272). Ibn Hajar commented on it saying: "This proves that ambiguous matters should not be discussed with the general public."

These narrations from the Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, show the correctness of this educational principle, and that such topics should not be taught to school students, because they cannot comprehend them and it could lead to confusion among some of them, particularly in believing things they should not believe about the Companions of the Messenger of Allah, peace be upon him. For more on this topic, refer to the book *Manhaj Kitabat al-Tarikh al-Islami* by Dr. Muhammad bin Samel (p. 252) and the article *Fadilat al-imsak 'amma shajar bayn al-sahabah* by Ziyad Sa'd al-Ghamdi in *Al-Bayan* magazine, issue 134.

If such issues are to be discussed, they should be entrusted to qualified scholars, experts in their field, sincere in their intentions, and free from any suspicion in their beliefs. They should be addressed at the level of the specialized, and not to the general public, so they do not lead to confusion. It should not be an issue for the marketplace where anyone, whether knowledgeable or ignorant, feels entitled to agree or disagree... How many times have the foolish spoken and the ignorant taken the lead when the voice of the scholars has been absent or hidden behind the veil of noble opinions? Yet, the foam will dissipate, and what benefits the people will remain on the earth. Thus, this is how Allah's wisdom has worked throughout history in the struggle between truth and falsehood, ancient and modern, to distinguish the good from the bad, for the truthful to stand out, and for the liars to be exposed, even if it takes time. (Khair al-Qurun article by Dr. Sulayman al-'Uda. See *Al-Da'wah* magazine, issue 1610).

How beautifully it has been said about Islamic history: It is a bright and shining history, a source of pride through the ages, and a gem on the forehead of time. No nation's history, whether ancient or modern, can compare to it. Yet, some events have cast dark shadows over its brilliance, starting after the death of the Prophet, peace be upon him, when some disagreements arose among some of the Companions, leading to wars such as the Battle of Siffin, the Battle of the Camel, the Day of al-Harra, and similar events. The Muslim student comes across these during some stages of their studies. We want to draw the attention of the teacher to the importance of...

The teacher must remain vigilant, wise, and cautious when presenting these events to students. The Companions, may Allah be pleased with them, are shining, radiant suns that illuminated human history with light. These suns vary in their ranks and differ in the types of virtues they possess, but they always remain at the highest levels of merit, in the peak of honor and glory. If those who study Islamic history were to distinguish between authentic and fabricated events regarding the conflicts among the Companions, they would be astonished by the false reports invented by the enemies of Islam—Jews, Magians, hypocrites, atheists, and resentful individuals. These enemies fabricated lies and falsely attributed them to the noble Companions out of oppression, malice, and deception. Their falsifications distorted the truth, casting a shadow over the radiant and pristine image of the Companions, who are truly the leaders of humanity and the finest of mankind. How could they not be, when they were the disciples of the noblest of creation and the master of all messengers, peace and blessings be upon him? (Adapted from the book "*Kalimāt Nāfi'ah*" by Nāji al-Tanṭāwī, p. 79.)

At this point, we can only hold firm to the words of Allah Almighty:

“And those who came after them say: ‘Our Lord, forgive us and our brothers who preceded us in faith, and do not place in our hearts any resentment towards those who have believed. Our Lord, indeed You are Kind and Merciful.’” [Surah Al-Hashr 59:10]

After all that I have mentioned, it has become evident—especially on the internet—that there are people who attack the noble Companions and reignite these historical events in a distorted and disgraceful manner. This is why I chose to discuss this topic: to defend the truth and the Companions of the Prophet, peace and blessings be upon him.

Events Following the Assassination of ‘Uthmān (may Allah be pleased with him) Until Just Before the Battle of the Camel

A great calamity befell the Muslims after the assassination of Caliph ‘Uthmān (may Allah be pleased with him). The Muslim community had previously experienced transitions of power following the deaths of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) and Abu Bakr (may Allah be pleased with him), but now they were faced with a new crisis—an instance of violent regime change. This resulted in the killing of the Caliph and left the position vacant. The opposition sought to pledge allegiance to one of the senior Companions to fill the power vacuum. They offered the leadership to Talha and Abdullah ibn ‘Umar, but neither of them accepted, recognizing that in such circumstances of turmoil, their acceptance would not be legitimate. The opposition did not truly represent the entire Muslim nation, but rather, the major Companions in Madinah were the ones whose decisions were accepted by people across the Islamic state. The opposition realized this after their initial attempts failed. (Fadā’il al-Ṣaḥābah by Imam Aḥmad, 2/573-574.)

Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah reported: “I was with my father (Ali) when ‘Uthmān was killed. My father entered his house. The Companions of the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) came to him and said: ‘This man has been killed, and there must be an imam for the people. We do not find anyone today more worthy of this position than you—none have greater precedence in Islam, nor are closer to the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him).’ He replied, ‘Do not do this. Being a minister is better for me than being a ruler.’ They said, ‘No, by Allah! We will not leave until we pledge allegiance to you.’ He said, ‘Then let it be in the mosque, for my pledge should not be made secretly, and it must be with the approval of the Muslims.’”

Sālim ibn Abi al-Ja’d reported that Abdullah ibn ‘Abbās (may Allah be pleased with them) said: “I was afraid that if he went to the mosque, there would be unrest against him. But he insisted on going to the mosque. When he entered, the Muhājirūn and Anṣār pledged allegiance to him, followed by the general public.”

There is another narration in which Abu Bishr al-‘Ābidī stated: “The Muhājirūn and Anṣār—including Talha and al-Zubayr—came to Ali and said: ‘The people cannot function without a leader, and things have gone on for too long.’ Ali said to them: ‘You have come to me repeatedly, and now I will say something to you. If you accept it, I will take on this responsibility; otherwise, I have no need for it.’ They responded: ‘We will accept whatever you say, in shā’ Allāh.’ So they pledged allegiance to him in the mosque.”

Another narration states that Talha and al-Zubayr said to Ali: "Extend your hand." Then Talha and al-Zubayr pledged allegiance to him, and this took place eighteen nights after the assassination of 'Uthmān (may Allah be pleased with him).

Additionally, there is a narration from 'Awf ibn Abi Jamīlah al-'Abdī, who said: "I bear witness that I heard Muhammad ibn Sīrīn say: 'Ali came to Talha and said: "Extend your hand, O Talha, so that I may pledge allegiance to you." Talha replied: "You are more deserving, and you are the Commander of the Faithful. Extend your hand." So Ali extended his hand, and Talha pledged allegiance to him.'"

All of these reports can be found in Tārīkh al-Ṭabarī (4/427-428) and (4/434), as well as in Fadā'il al-Ṣaḥābah by Imam Aḥmad (2/573).

Ibn Sa'd mentioned in Al-Tabaqat (3/31) that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) was pledged allegiance as Caliph on Friday in the year 35 AH. Among the Companions who pledged allegiance were Talha, Al-Zubayr, and a group of the Companions present in Medina.

Al-Mas'udi stated in Muruj al-Dhahab (p. 358) that Ali was given a private pledge of allegiance on the same day that 'Uthman ibn 'Affan (may Allah be pleased with him) was killed. He further mentioned that the public pledge of allegiance took place four days after 'Uthman's assassination.

Al-Ya'qubi wrote in his Tarikh (1/178) that Talha and Al-Zubayr pledged allegiance to Ali and that the first to shake his hand in allegiance was Talha ibn 'Ubaydullah (may Allah be pleased with him).

Al-Hafidh Al-Dhahabi stated in Duwal al-Islam (1/28) regarding the pledge: "When 'Uthman was killed, people came to Ali and said: 'The people must have a leader.' Talha, Al-Zubayr, Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas, and other prominent figures were present. Talha was the first to pledge allegiance, followed by the rest of the people."

As for the conflicting narrations recorded by Imam Al-Tabari in his Tarikh (4/429), (4/431), and (4/435), some claim that Talha and Al-Zubayr pledged allegiance under coercion. One such report, narrated through Al-Zuhri, states: "The people pledged allegiance to Ali ibn Abi Talib, and he sent for Al-Zubayr and Talha to summon them for allegiance. Talha hesitated, so Al-Ashtar drew his sword and said, 'By Allah, you will pledge allegiance, or I will strike you between the eyes!' Talha responded, 'Where is the escape from it?!' So he pledged allegiance, and Al-Zubayr and the people followed suit." Other narrations suggest that they pledged allegiance with swords hanging over their necks. However, all these accounts are invalid because they originate from Al-Waqidi and Abu Mikhnaf, both of whom are known fabricators.

Ibn al-'Arabi stated in Al-'Awasil min al-Qawasil (p. 148) about these claims: "If someone says that Talha said, 'I pledged allegiance while the noose was on my neck,' then we reply that this statement was fabricated by someone who wanted to introduce an unfamiliar expression. It is an invention, just as certain dialects distort other words. This was a lie that was not well thought out."

Regarding the statement that Talha pledged allegiance with a paralyzed hand, followed by the remark, "By Allah, this matter will never be completed," Ibn al-'Arabi commented in *Al-'Awasim* (p. 148-149): "As for those who say that Talha's hand was paralyzed and that his pledge was invalid, they ignore the fact that this was the very hand that shielded the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) in battle. Such a hand deserves every honor, and it was protected from all harm. The matter was completed as decreed, and divine destiny was fulfilled as willed. The innovator who fabricated this falsehood did not realize that his claim is actually proof against him."

In *Tarikh al-Tabari* (4/429), Ibn Shabba narrated from Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah that the Ansar pledged allegiance to Ali except for a small group. Among those mentioned as not pledging allegiance were Sa'd ibn Abi Waqqas, Ibn 'Umar, Usama ibn Zayd, and Muhammad ibn Maslamah.

However, this claim is incorrect because their presence with Ali and their subsequent apologies for not supporting him in his conflicts—whether against the people of Sham or in other battles in Iraq—are clear indications that they had indeed pledged allegiance to him. Otherwise, they would have simply left him and would not have felt the need to visit him and offer excuses. Their actions show that they acknowledged an obligation of obedience to him.

Al-Baqillani, in *Al-Tamhid fi al-Radd 'ala al-Mulhidah* (p. 233-234), justified the stance of the Companions who refrained from supporting Ali, stating: "If someone asks, 'If Ali's leadership was as legitimate and established as you describe, then why did Sa'd, Ibn 'Umar, Ibn Maslamah, Usama, and others refrain from supporting him and obeying him?' The answer is that none of these individuals, whether named or unnamed, doubted his legitimacy or believed his rule to be invalid. Rather, they refrained from joining his battles against fellow Muslims out of fear of causing greater harm and in an effort to avoid sin."

Ibn al-'Arabi further wrote in *Al-'Awasim* (p. 150): "Some claim that a group of Companions—including Sa'd, Ibn Maslamah, Ibn 'Umar, and Usama—refused to support Ali. To them, we say: Their allegiance to him was not in question. As for their abstention from fighting alongside him, some indeed refrained from doing so because they saw the matter as a case of independent reasoning (*ijtihad*). Each person exercised his own judgment and followed what he believed to be correct."

Conclusion

Even if some narrations suggest that certain Companions did not pledge allegiance to Ali, this does not undermine his caliphate.

Furthermore, even if it is established that Mu'awiyah refused to pledge allegiance to Ali, this does not negate the consensus of the people of influence (*ahl al-hall wa al-'aqd*) regarding Ali's caliphate. Similarly, the refusal of Sa'd ibn 'Ubadah to pledge allegiance to Abu Bakr does not negate the consensus on Abu Bakr's caliphate. Moreover, Mu'awiyah himself acknowledged that Ali was more deserving of leadership than he was; his only argument for delaying his allegiance was his demand that the killers of 'Uthman be handed over for retribution.

Al-Mawardi, in *Al-Ahkam al-Sultaniyyah* (p. 30), concludes that the obligation of the Imamate or allegiance (*bay'ah*) is a communal duty (*fard kifayah*), similar to jihad and the pursuit of knowledge. If those qualified fulfill it, the obligation is lifted from the rest of the people.

After assuming the caliphate, Ali dismissed some governors and appointed others in their place. He removed Khalid ibn al-As from his position as governor of Mecca and appointed Abu Qatadah al-Ansari in his stead for two months. Then, he dismissed him and appointed Qutham ibn al-Abbas. It appears that public opinion in Mecca was angered over 'Uthman's killing, and this anger intensified due to the large number of people who had fled from Medina to Mecca following the rebels' control over the city. (*Tarikh Khalifah*, p. 178, 201; *Asr al-Khilafah al-Rashidah* by Akram al-'Umari, p. 139-146).

Ali sent 'Uthman ibn Hunayf al-Ansari to Basra as its governor, replacing 'Abdullah ibn 'Amir, who had left Basra for Mecca. The people of Basra were divided over the new governor: some pledged allegiance, some abstained, and others refused to pledge allegiance until the killers of 'Uthman were executed. (*Siyar A'lam al-Nubala'*, 2/322).

As for Egypt, its governor, 'Abdullah ibn Sa'd ibn Abi al-Sarh, had left for Asqalan, and Muhammad ibn Abi Hudhayfah took control of it for an entire year. He faced opposition from those demanding retribution for 'Uthman's killers. After his death, Qays ibn Sa'd ibn 'Ubadah became governor, successfully securing allegiance to Ali and establishing peace in the region. (*Musannaf 'Abd al-Razzaq*, 5/458, with an authentic chain to Al-Zuhri).

Ali sent a message to Mu'awiyah requesting his allegiance, to which Mu'awiyah replied: "If you are truthful, then hand over 'Uthman's killers so that we may execute them, and we will be the quickest of people to pledge allegiance to you." (*Akhbar al-Tiwal* by Al-Dinawari, p. 162-163).

If someone argues that Ali erred in dismissing all of 'Uthman's governors before receiving allegiance from the people of the provinces, the response is: Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) was a legitimate imam who exercised his own judgment (*ijtihad*). He had the authority to dismiss 'Uthman's governors if he deemed it beneficial. The Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him), despite being infallible, had appointed Khalid ibn Sa'id ibn al-'As over Sana'a and 'Amr ibn al-'As over Oman. Yet, Abu Bakr dismissed both after him. Similarly, Abu Bakr appointed Khalid ibn al-Walid and Al-Muthanna ibn Harithah, but 'Umar dismissed both afterward. 'Umar also appointed 'Amr ibn al-'As and Al-Mughirah ibn Shu'bah, but 'Uthman later dismissed them. (*Tarikh Khalifah*, p. 97, 102, 122-123, 155, 178; *Tarikh al-Tabari*, 3/343, 4/241).

Thus, when Ali saw it necessary to remove certain officials, he acted accordingly. Can any reasonable person criticize Abu Bakr, 'Umar, or 'Uthman for their similar decisions to remove competent governors?

Moreover, the claim that Ali dismissed all of 'Uthman's governors is inaccurate. In reality, the only removals were Mu'awiyah in Syria, Khalid ibn al-As in Mecca, and Abu Musa al-Ash'ari in Kufa—though he was later reinstated. (*Tarikh al-Tabari*, 4/442; *Tarikh Khalifah*, p. 201).

As for Basra, its governor left voluntarily. In Yemen, its governor, Ya'la ibn Munyah, took the province's tax revenue and traveled to Mecca after 'Uthman's assassination. He later joined

Talha and Al-Zubayr and participated in the Battle of the Camel. Ibn Abi al-Sarh left for Palestine and remained there until his death after Muhammad ibn Abi Hudhayfah took control of Egypt. (Tarikh al-Tabari, 4/421, 4/450).

Thus, the governors of Yemen and Basra resigned on their own, the governor of Egypt was removed by the one who seized control of the region, and the governor of Kufa was reinstated. The only clear dismissals by Ali were of Mu'awiyah in Syria and Khalid in Mecca.

As for the claim that he dismissed them before receiving the allegiance of the people in the provinces, the response is: The appointment of provincial governors by the imam is not conditional upon receiving the pledge of allegiance from the people of those regions. Once the people of influence (ahl al-hall wa al-'aqd) give their pledge, it becomes binding upon all distant lands under the caliphate. If a caliph's appointment of governors were contingent upon receiving pledges from the provinces, then Abu Bakr's caliphate would not have been valid, as he acted by dispatching Usama's army and fighting the apostates before the people of Mecca, Ta'if, and other regions pledged allegiance to him. Similarly, 'Umar and 'Uthman took decisions regarding the affairs of the Muslims before all the provinces had pledged allegiance to them.

The Lead-Up to the Battle of the Camel and the Events That Preceded It

Four months after Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) was given allegiance, Talha and Al-Zubayr left Medina with the intention of performing 'Umrah. Likewise, 'Abdullah ibn 'Amir departed from Basra, and Ya'la ibn Munyah left Yemen for Mecca at different times.

As for the claim that Al-Zubayr and Talha requested permission from Ali to go to Basra and Kufa to gather troops to fight the killers of 'Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him), this report is baseless. Talha and Al-Zubayr (may Allah be pleased with them) were keen on reconciling the people, extinguishing the flames of discord, and preventing further bloodshed among Muslims, as will be explained.

Talha, Al-Zubayr, Ya'la, 'Abdullah ibn 'Amir, and 'A'ishah (may Allah be pleased with them all) gathered after much deliberation and decided to travel to Basra to reconcile the people after the turmoil following the murder of 'Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him), not to demand retribution for his killing.

The evidence for this is the incident at Al-Haw'ab—a place near Basra, which was known in pre-Islamic times and was named after Abu Bakr ibn Kilab Al-Haw'ab or after Al-Haw'ab, daughter of Kalb ibn Wabarah Al-Quda'iyah (Mu'jam al-Buldan, 2/314).

While on the way to Basra, the army passed by a location called Al-Haw'ab, where dogs barked at them. When 'A'ishah heard the barking, she became anxious and asked, "What is this place?" They replied, "This is Al-Haw'ab." She then remembered a hadith of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him).

Ahmad, Ibn Hibban, and Al-Hakim narrated from Qays ibn Hazm that when 'A'ishah reached Al-Haw'ab and heard the barking of the dogs, she said: "I think I should turn back, for the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) said to us: Which one of you will be barked at by the dogs of Al-Haw'ab?" Al-Zubayr then said to her: "You want to turn

back?!”—meaning, do not turn back, for the people respect you. He added, “Perhaps Allah will bring reconciliation through you.” This is the wording from Shu’bah, while Yahya’s version states:

“When ‘A’ishah was approaching, she reached the waters of Banu ‘Amir at night, and the dogs barked. She asked: ‘What is this water?’ They replied: ‘This is Al-Haw’ab.’ She said: ‘I think I should turn back.’ Someone with her said: ‘No, continue forward so that the Muslims may see you, and Allah will reconcile them through you.’ She replied: ‘The Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him) once said to me: What will happen when one of you is barked at by the dogs of Al-Haw’ab?’” (Al-Silsilah al-Sahihah, 1/846).

Some people have found the hadith of Al-Haw’ab problematic and have rejected it, including Imam Ibn al-‘Arabi in *Al-‘Awāsim min al-Qawāsim* (p. 162). Sheikh Muhibb al-Din al-Khatib supported him in his commentary on this valuable book (p. 152). However, this hadith is authentic, and their reasoning appears to be that if ‘A’ishah (may Allah be pleased with her) knew the location was Al-Haw’ab, she should have turned back. The hadith indicates that she did not turn back, which, in their view, is not befitting of the Mother of the Believers.

Sheikh Al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on him) responded to this issue, saying: “Not everything that happens to the most virtuous individuals is necessarily appropriate for them, for the only one protected from error is the one whom Allah safeguards. A Sunni should not exaggerate his respect for a revered figure to the point of elevating them to the rank of the infallible Imams of the Shi’ah. There is no doubt that the departure of the Mother of the Believers was a mistake from the outset. This is why she considered returning when she realized that the Prophet’s prophecy was fulfilled at Al-Haw’ab. However, Al-Zubayr (may Allah be pleased with him) convinced her to continue by saying: ‘Perhaps Allah will bring reconciliation through you.’ Undoubtedly, he was mistaken in that as well.” (Al-Silsilah al-Sahihah, 1/854-855).

Ibn Hajar stated regarding this hadith: “Its chain of narration meets the criteria of Al-Bukhari and Muslim.” (Fath al-Bari, 13/59-60). Al-Haythami said: “It was narrated by Ahmad, Abu Ya’la, and Al-Bazzar. The narrators of Ahmad’s report are those of the authentic collections.” (Majma’ al-Zawa’id, 7/234). Al-Albani also authenticated it in Al-Sahihah and refuted those who questioned its authenticity, citing its transmission by various scholars (Al-Silsilah al-Sahihah, 1/846-855).

At this point, Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) realized the gravity of the situation and how the conflict could lead to the fragmentation of the Islamic state. He called upon the people of Medina to join him, gathering around 700 men. Many Companions chose to abstain from involvement in the conflict. Ali then left Medina, heading toward Iraq. He encamped at Al-Rabadha, where 200 more men joined his army, bringing the total to 900. (Tarikh Dimashq by Ibn ‘Asakir, 42/456).

Al-Hasan ibn Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) tried to dissuade his father from going to Iraq. He wept over the division and discord that had afflicted the Muslims, but Ali refused to turn back and insisted on proceeding. (Musannaf Ibn Abi Shaybah, 15/99-100, with a sound chain of narration; Tarikh Dimashq by Ibn ‘Asakir, 42/456-457).

There are narrations that suggest that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) left Medina in pursuit of the people of Jamal, but this did not happen. The correct view is that he left Medina with the firm intention of heading to Kufa to be near the people of Sham. He did not leave in pursuit of the people of Jamal.

The following points clarify this matter:

A. Some narrations mention that when Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) left Medina, he stayed in Al-Rabadha for several days. Such an action does not resemble that of someone chasing after a group. Moreover, Al-Rabadha is located on the road to Kufa, while the people of Jamal were taking the route to Basra.

B. Other narrations state that when Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) left Al-Rabadha, he headed to Fayd (Mu'jam al-Ma'alim al-Jughrafiyyah fi al-Sirah al-Nabawiyyah by 'Aatiq al-Biladi, p. 239), then to Al-Tha'labiyyah (Mu'jam al-Buldan by Yaqut al-Hamawi, 2/78). These places are along the road to Kufa. This confirms that Ali was not following the people of Jamal, otherwise, he would have abandoned the route to Kufa and taken the road to Basra.

Particularly, anyone leaving Medina for Basra would typically head towards Al-Naqirah (Mu'jam al-Buldan, 5/298), which lies on the route to Kufa, and from there, take a right turn toward Al-Nibaj (Mu'jam al-Buldan, 5/255), which is on the road to Basra (Kitab al-Manasik by Al-Harbi, 322, 587).

However, Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) did not do this. Instead, he bypassed Al-Naqirah and continued his journey to Fayd and then Al-Tha'labiyyah. For a discussion and critique of the narrations regarding this matter, see Istishhad 'Uthman wa Waq'at al-Jamal by Khalid Al-Ghayth (pp. 183-184).

At this point, after camping in Al-Rabadha, Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) sent two messengers to mobilize the people of Kufa: Muhammad ibn Abi Bakr and Muhammad ibn Ja'far. However, they failed in their mission because Abu Musa al-Ash'ari, the governor of Kufa under Ali, chose to remain neutral in the conflict and warned the people against involvement (Sunan Abi Dawud, 4/459-460, with a sound chain).

This report is further supported by what Al-Bukhari narrated in his Sahih (13/58) through Abu Wa'il, who said:

"Abu Musa and Abu Mas'ud entered upon 'Ammar when Ali had sent him to the people of Kufa to mobilize them. They said, 'We have never seen you do something we dislike more than your haste in this matter since you accepted Islam.' 'Ammar replied, 'I have never seen from you both something I dislike more than your delay in this matter since you became Muslims.' Then, he gifted them each a robe, and they all went to the mosque."

Ali then headed to Dhi Qar, which was a water source belonging to Banu Bakr ibn Wa'il near Kufa (Mu'jam al-Buldan, 4/293-294), where he camped. From there, he sent Abdullah ibn 'Abbas, followed by his son Al-Hasan and Ammar ibn Yasir, to mobilize the people of Kufa (Tarikh al-Tabari, 4/482, with a sound chain to Al-Zuhri, Mursal; also in Fath al-Bari, 13/63).

The reason for this shift in direction was that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) heard reports of disturbances in Basra, which had led to the expulsion of his governor from the city.

Al-Bukhari narrated in his Sahih from Abu Wa'il:

"When Ali sent 'Ammar and Al-Hasan to Kufa to mobilize the people, 'Ammar delivered a sermon, saying: 'I know that she (Aisha) is his (the Prophet's) wife in this world and the Hereafter, but Allah is testing you: will you follow him or her?'"

Similarly, Abu Maryam reported:

"When Talha, Al-Zubayr, and 'Aisha headed to Basra, Ali sent 'Ammar ibn Yasir and Al-Hasan ibn Ali. They arrived in Kufa and ascended the pulpit. Al-Hasan stood at the top of the pulpit while 'Ammar stood below him. We gathered around them, and I heard 'Ammar say: 'Indeed, 'Aisha has gone to Basra, and by Allah, she is the wife of your Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) in this world and the Hereafter. However, Allah, the Blessed and Most High, is testing you to see whether you obey Him or her.'"

Al-Hafiz Ibn Hajar commented in Fath al-Bari:

"'Ammar meant by this that the correct stance in this incident was with Ali. However, 'Aisha did not cease to be a Muslim, nor did she lose her status as the wife of the Prophet (peace and blessings be upon him) in Paradise. This statement reflects 'Ammar's fairness and his keen adherence to speaking the truth."

He also quoted Ibn Hubayrah, who said:

"This hadith shows that 'Ammar was truthful in speech and was not swayed by partisanship to the extent that he would vilify his opponent. He acknowledged 'Aisha's complete virtue despite the conflict between them." (Fath al-Bari, 13/63).

Here, it is worth noting that 'Ammar's (may Allah be pleased with him) statement about 'Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) was based on his lack of knowledge regarding the true purpose behind the departure of the people of Jamal, which was that they had set out to reconcile between people. See Istishhad 'Uthman wa Waq'at al-Jamal by Khalid Al-Ghayth (p. 185).

When the delegation from Kufa arrived at Dhi Qar to meet Ali, he addressed them:

"O people of Kufa, you have faced the kings of Persia and crushed their armies, and I have summoned you to witness our brothers from the people of Basra. If they return, that is what we desire. If they refuse, we will treat them with kindness until they are the ones to begin oppression. We will not leave any means of reconciliation except that we will prefer it over anything that leads to corruption, if Allah wills." (Al-Bidaya wa al-Nihaya by Ibn Kathir, 7/237).

Some narrations mention that the people of Jamal, after leaving Mecca and approaching Awtas—a plain located on the route of the Iraqi pilgrims coming from Najd, approximately 143 km northeast of Mecca (Mu'jam al-Buldan, 1/281)—turned right from there, abandoning the path to Basra, and traveled alongside it until they reached Basra.

This report, however, is not authentic concerning those noble companions, as it portrays the people of Jamal, who had set out for reconciliation, as a group of rebels against the caliphate, implying that their fear of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) caused them to avoid taking the direct route to Basra to prevent him from catching up with them. However, upon examining their route from Mecca to Basra, it becomes clear that they took the direct path to Basra and did not deviate from it, contrary to what some narrations suggest.

This can be explained as follows:

A. Some narrations claim that when the people of Jamal reached Awtaas, they turned right and abandoned the path to Basra, traveling parallel to it.

This report is misleading, as it gives the impression that they left the road to Basra. However, in reality, anyone traveling to Basra from Mecca would naturally turn right from Awtaas, just as the people of Jamal did. Meanwhile, those heading to Kufa would turn left from there, as the roads to Basra and Kufa diverge right and left after Awtaas.

B. An authentic hadith recorded by Imam Ahmad states that the dogs of Haw'ab barked at 'Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) when she reached the territory of Banu 'Amir.

The Banu 'Amir referred to here are Banu 'Amir ibn Sa'sa'a, and Haw'ab is a water source belonging to the Arabs, located on the route to Basra and owned by Banu Bakr ibn Kilab. Banu Kilab is a subtribe of 'Amir ibn Sa'sa'a (Mu'jam al-Buldan, 1/314). Since Banu Kilab resided in Dariyyah (Kitab al-Manasik by Al-Harbi, p. 612; Mu'jam al-Buldan, 3/457), this means that Haw'ab was located in Dariyyah. Since Dariyyah was on the Basran pilgrimage route (Kitab al-Manasik by Al-Harbi, p. 594), this confirms that the people of Jamal followed the standard route between Mecca and Basra and did not deviate from it, as some narrations falsely claim. For further discussion and critique of these narrations, see Istishhad 'Uthman wa Waq'at al-Jamal by Khalid Al-Ghayth (pp. 166–168).

The Battle of Jamal and the Role of the Saba'iyyah in Its Ignition

During this period, the army from Mecca had arrived in Basra. 'Uthman ibn Hunayf (may Allah be pleased with him), the governor of Basra under Ali, sent a messenger to them to inquire about the reason for their arrival. Their response was:

"The rabble from various lands and the tribal dissidents invaded the sanctuary of the Messenger of Allah (peace and blessings be upon him), committing violations within it and providing refuge to those who caused mischief. They thereby incurred the curse of Allah and His Messenger, as they unjustly killed the leader of the Muslims without reason or justification. They shed forbidden blood, seized unlawful wealth, and desecrated the sacred land and the sacred month. We have come out to inform the Muslims of what these people have done and what the situation is behind us, and to guide them in rectifying this matter. We have recited the verse:

'There is no good in much of their private conversations, except for those who enjoin charity, righteousness, or reconciliation between people.' [Surah An-Nisa' 4:114]

We seek reconciliation as commanded by Allah, the Almighty, and His Messenger (peace and blessings be upon him), for both the young and the old, the men and the women. This is our mission: to command what is right and encourage it, and to forbid what is wrong and urge its removal.” (Tarikh al-Tabari, 4/462, through the narration of Saif ibn ‘Umar).

After this, the army from Mecca advanced toward the treasury and the government house (Dar al-Rizq). However, they were confronted by Hakim ibn Jabalah, one of the rebels who had participated in the siege of ‘Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him) in Medina. He had 700 men from his tribe with him, and a battle ensued, in which Hakim ibn Jabalah was killed. ‘Uthman ibn Hunayf then left Basra and joined Ali (may Allah be pleased with him). (Tarikh al-Tabari, 4/468, 471).

There is no authentic chain of narration that can be relied upon to establish that he was beaten and had the hair of his face plucked out (may Allah be pleased with him). The noble companions (may Allah be pleased with them) were far above committing such an ugly act of mutilation. This is from the narrations of Abu Mikhnaf, the liar. See Marwiyat Abu Mikhnaf fi Tarikh al-Tabari (p. 258).

When Ali’s army camped at Dhi Qar, he sent Abdullah ibn ‘Abbas to Talha and Zubair to ask them: “Has anything occurred in his rule that warrants discontent? Such as injustice in judgment or monopolizing wealth?” Zubair replied: “Not in a single one of these matters.” (Fada’il al-Sahaba by Imam Ahmad, 2/596, with an authentic chain, and Musannaf by Ibn Abi Shayba, 15/267, with slight variation).

In conclusion, Aisha, Talha, and Zubair (may Allah be pleased with them) set out with the intention of reconciliation and uniting the Muslims. The fighting and wars that accompanied this were neither of their own volition nor intended by them; rather, it was instigated by the Saba’iyyah and their mobs. Moreover, reconciliation was not the goal of Talha, Zubair, and Aisha alone—Ali also sought nothing in his march toward them except peace and unity. In general, Ali, Talha, Zubair, and Aisha (may Allah be pleased with them) all saw reconciliation and avoiding war as the best course of action, and they parted on that agreement. This was a remarkable stance from Talha and Zubair (may Allah be pleased with them), no less honorable than the stance of the Commander of the Faithful, Ali (may Allah be pleased with him), as all of them accepted and agreed to reconciliation, each being reluctant to shed blood or kill a fellow Muslim.

No rational person who examines the previous texts can conclude that the leaders of both sides were the ones who initiated and ignited the battle. How could that be when both parties had sincerely accepted the idea of peace and reconciliation? Rather, it was the murderers of Uthman, the followers of Ibn Saba’—may they receive from Allah what they deserve—who ignited and fueled the conflict to escape retribution.

One might ask: Why did Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) allow the troublemakers to remain in his army and not punish them for their heinous crime?

The reason Ali kept them in his army was that they were leaders among their people. Ali saw that patience with them was necessary until matters stabilized.

Imam Al-Tahawi addressed this in his Sharh al-Tahawiyya (p. 483), saying:

“In Ali’s army, there were those among the tyrants and Khawarij who had killed Uthman—some whose identities were unknown, some whose tribes protected them, some against whom no conclusive evidence had been established, and some whose hypocrisy was hidden and had not yet fully manifested.”

In any case, Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) took a cautious stance toward them, distancing himself from their actions. Although he did not expel them from his army, he dealt with them warily and regarded them with suspicion. Imam Al-Tabari stated in his *Tarikh* (4/445) that Ali did not appoint any of them to leadership positions while preparing for his march to Sham (referring to the Battle of Siffin). Instead, he summoned his son, Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah, and handed him the standard. He appointed Abdullah ibn Abbas (may Allah be pleased with them) as the commander of the right wing, ‘Umar ibn Abi Salama (may Allah be pleased with him) over the left wing, and placed Abu Layla ibn ‘Umar ibn al-Jarrah at the vanguard of the army, while appointing Quthm ibn al-Abbas (may Allah be pleased with them) as governor of Medina.

This was Ali’s way of declaring his disavowal of those renegades and proving his ability to govern the Muslims without relying on them. He had sufficient support from loyal and devoted followers of his caliphate, making reliance on or seeking favor with them unnecessary. This was the most he could do under the circumstances, and it was sufficient as a justification for his actions. These individuals numbered in the hundreds and had familial ties and tribal connections within his army. Had he dealt with them too harshly, the rope of discord might have extended further within the Ummah, just as it did with Talha, Zubair, and Aisha in Basra when they executed some of them, causing their tribes to retaliate and withdraw from them. (*Ifadat al-Akhyar bi Bara’at al-Abrar* by Al-Tibani, 2/52).

When the people settled into their positions and became calm, Ali, Talha, and Zubair went out and met, discussing what they had differed over. They found no solution better than reconciliation, so they parted on that agreement. Ali returned to his camp, while Talha and Zubair returned to theirs. Talha and Zubair sent word to their leaders, and Ali did the same, except to those who had besieged Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him). The people spent the night with the intention of reconciliation and peace, certain that peace would prevail. They were near each other, some even visiting the others, speaking of nothing but reconciliation. That night was the best they had since the killing of Uthman, while those who had incited the fitna spent the worst night they had ever experienced, realizing they were on the brink of destruction. They spent the entire night consulting among themselves. See *Tarikh al-Tabari* (4/506-507) through the narration of Saif ibn Umar.

They then secretly agreed to ignite the war. At dawn, under the cover of darkness, they launched their attack, catching their neighbors unaware and striking them with their swords. The people of Basra rose, and everyone fought back against those who had ambushed them. Talha mounted his horse, calling out, but the people overwhelmed him and would not listen. He could only say, “Uff, uff! Moths to the flame and flies of greed.” (*Tarikh Khalifa*, p. 182). And who else could these “moths to the flame and flies of greed” be but the Saba’iyyah?

The battle erupted among the rabble, spiraling out of the control of Ali, Talha, and Zubair. Talha, while being struck by arrows, said: "O Allah, take from me today in retribution for Uthman until You are satisfied." (Tarikh Khalifa, p. 185; Duwal al-Islam by Al-Dhahabi, 1/28).

Al-Hasan ibn Ali described his father's state, saying: "I saw him when the fighting intensified; he clung to me and said, 'O Hasan, I wish I had died twenty Hajj seasons—or years—before this.' I said, 'O father, I used to warn you about this,' and he replied, 'O my son, I did not foresee it reaching this extent.'" (Musannaf Ibn Abi Shayba, 15/288, with an authentic chain; Al-Sunnah by Abdullah ibn Ahmad, 2/566, 589).

Ibn Abi Shayba also narrated (Musannaf, 15/275) through Habib ibn Abi Thabit that Ali said on the day of Jamal: "O Allah, this is not what I intended. O Allah, this is not what I intended."

As for the narrations claiming that Talha incited people to fight and was then struck and killed, they are rejected because of the established justice of the Sahaba (may Allah be pleased with them). Talha retreated behind the army, and a stray arrow, whose source was unknown, struck the joint of his knee, hitting a previous wound from the Battle of Uhud while he was defending the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ). He began to bleed heavily, and his servant carried him to Basra, placing him in an abandoned house where he died (may Allah be pleased with him). (Tarikh al-Tabari, 4/512, 514, through Saif ibn Umar).

It was said that the one who shot him was Marwan ibn al-Hakam, but there is no proof for this. Upon analyzing these narrations, Marwan ibn al-Hakam is proven innocent of this accusation for the following reasons:

1. There is a narration from Marwan ibn al-Hakam in Sahih al-Bukhari, and it is known that Imam al-Bukhari (may Allah have mercy on him) was extremely precise and meticulous in accepting narrators. If it were true that Marwan had killed Talha, this would have been sufficient reason to reject his narration and question his integrity. The narration is found in Sahih al-Bukhari with Fath al-Bari (3/493).

2. Ibn Kathir (may Allah have mercy on him) in Al-Bidaya wa'l-Nihaya (7/248) cast doubt on this claim, stating: "It is said that the one who shot him with this arrow was Marwan ibn al-Hakam. And it is also said that it was someone else, and in my view, the latter is more likely, even though the first is more famous. And Allah knows best."

3. Praise from scholars such as Imam Ahmad and Hafiz Ibn Hajar for Marwan. See Siyar A'lam al-Nubala' by Al-Dhahabi (3/477) and Al-Isaba by Ibn Hajar (6/257-259).

4. The falsehood of the alleged motive behind Marwan's supposed killing of Talha, which was the accusation that Marwan blamed Talha for aiding in Uthman's murder. This claim is unfounded, as there is no authentic evidence proving that any of the Sahaba assisted in the killing of Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him).

5. Marwan and Talha (may Allah be pleased with them) were in the same camp on the day of Jamal, advocating for reconciliation among the people.

6. Mu'awiya (may Allah be pleased with him) appointed Marwan as governor over Madinah and Makkah. See the report of his appointment in Tarikh al-Tabari (5/293).

Had Marwan truly committed such an act, Mu'awiya would not have entrusted him with authority over the people in the most sacred places in the sight of Allah. For more details on this topic, refer to *Istishhad Uthman wa Waq'at al-Jamal* by Khalid al-Ghayth (p. 202-203).

During the battle, Ali said to Zubair: "Do you remember when the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said: 'O Zubair, by Allah, you will fight him while you are unjust to him'?" (*Tarikh Dimashq* by Ibn Asakir, 18/408-410).

Al-Hakim narrated in *Al-Mustadrak* (3/365-366) through multiple chains that Ali reminded Zubair of the Prophet's (ﷺ) statement: "You will fight Ali while you are unjust to him," and that is why he withdrew.

Ishaq narrated through Isma'il ibn Abi Khalid from Abd al-Salam—a man from his tribe—who said: "Ali privately spoke with Zubair on the day of Jamal and said: 'I adjure you by Allah, did you hear the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say, while you were twisting my hand: "You will fight him while you are unjust to him, and he will prevail over you"?' Zubair replied: 'I heard it. I will not fight you.'" (*Fath al-Bari*, 13/60; *Al-Matalib al-Aliyah*, 4/301).

Ibn Asakir in his *Tarikh* (18/410) and Ibn Kathir in *Al-Bidaya wa'l-Nihaya* (7/242) narrated that when Zubair decided to return to Madinah, his son Abdullah confronted him, asking: "What is the matter?" Zubair replied: "Ali reminded me of a hadith I heard from the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), so I am returning." His son said: "Did you come for battle? You only came to reconcile between the people, and Allah will set this matter right."

Indeed, Zubair's position was one of striving for reconciliation until the very last moment. Al-Hakim narrated in *Al-Mustadrak* (3/366) through Abi Harb ibn Abi al-Aswad al-Dili that Zubair worked to bring peace between the people, but when the battle broke out and matters became chaotic, he left and abandoned the fight.

This action by Zubair (may Allah be pleased with him) aligns with his true intent in coming to Basra, contrary to the claims of some reports that portray him as one of the inciters of the battle.

As Zubair was withdrawing, Ibn Jurmuz spotted him, followed him, and caught up with him while he was napping at midday in Wadi al-Siba'. Ibn Jurmuz attacked and killed him, then stripped him of his sword and armor. (*Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Nihal* by Ibn Hazm, 4/239). Ibn Kathir mentioned that this account is the most widely accepted. (*Al-Bidaya wa'l-Nihaya*, 7/250).

Ibn Hajar mentioned in *Fath al-Bari* (6/264-265, 7/102) that Ibn Jurmuz came to Ali, seeking favor for what he had done. Ali took Zubair's sword in his hand and said: "How often did this sword remove distress from the face of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ)!" Then he declared: "Give glad tidings to the killer of Ibn Safiyyah (i.e., Zubair) of the Fire." See *Musnad Ahmad* (1/89, 102), authenticated by Al-Hakim in *Al-Mustadrak* (4/367), and mentioned by Ahmad in *Fada'il al-Sahaba* with a good chain (2/736-737) with a similar wording: "The killer of Zubair came seeking permission [to meet Ali]. The servant came and said: 'This is the killer of Zubair seeking permission.' Ali replied: 'Let the killer of Zubair enter the Fire.'" The same happened with the killer of Talha.

This narration is further supported by what Imam Ahmad recorded in Fada'il al-Sahaba (2/737) with a good chain. When Ibn Jurmuz sought permission to enter upon Ali, Ali asked: "Who is this?" They replied: "Ibn Jurmuz seeks permission." Ali said: "Let him in, for the killer of Zubair will enter the Fire. I heard the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say: 'Every prophet has a disciple, and my disciple is Zubair.'"

In explaining Ibn Jurmuz's boldness in killing Zubair, Abu Nu'aym al-Asbahani in Kitab al-Imamah (p. 322) stated: "In the days of Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him), many people had not accompanied the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), and those who recognized the virtue of the Sahaba had become scarce."

At this point, Ka'b ibn Sawr took the news to Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) and said: "Hurry! The people have begun to fight!" The battle was near Basra, so they placed her howdah on a camel—its name is reported to be Askar—and she sat in it, covering it with armor. She then set off to the battlefield, hoping that her presence would stop the fighting when they saw her.

When she arrived, Aisha handed a Mushaf to Ka'b and told him: "Leave the camel, step forward, raise the Book of Allah, and call the people to it." The instigators of the fitna realized that if Ka'b was allowed to proceed, the fighting would stop. So when he stood up, raised the Mushaf, and began calling the people, arrows rained down on him, killing him. As reported in Tarikh al-Tabari.

(4/ 513) From the narration of Saif ibn Umar, and Ibn Asakir in Tarikh Dimashq (7/88).

Then they began striking toward the camel, intending to kill Aisha, but Allah saved her. She began calling out: "Stop the fighting," and Ali began calling from behind the army: "Stop the fighting," but the leaders of the fitna persisted. Umm al-Mu'minin then began to pray against the killers of Uthman, saying: "O Allah, curse the killers of Uthman." The army began calling out along with her. When Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) heard the people of Basra calling out during the battle, he said: "What is this noise?" They replied: "Aisha is calling out, and they are calling out with her against the killers of Uthman and their followers." Ali then came forward and began calling out: "O Allah, curse the killers of Uthman and their followers." (Al-Tabari, 4/513).

Ibn Abi Shaiba narrated in Al-Musannaf (15/277) and Al-Bayhaqi in Al-Sunan al-Kubra (8/181) that Ali heard the sound of Umm al-Mu'minin on the day of Jamal and said: "Look at what they are saying." They returned and said: "They are shouting for the killers of Uthman." Ali said: "O Allah, let the killers of Uthman be exposed to disgrace."

This narration is supported by what Imam Ahmad narrated in Fada'il al-Sahaba (1/455) with an authentic chain, from Muhammad ibn al-Hanafiyyah who said: "Ali was informed that Aisha was cursing the killers of Uthman in the Marbad. He raised his hands until they reached his face and said: 'I also curse the killers of Uthman. May they be cursed in the plains and the mountains,' he said it two or three times." And the voices of supplication rose in both armies.

Al-Harith ibn Suwayd al-Kufi—a trustworthy eyewitness—said: "I saw us on the day of Jamal, our lances and theirs were intertwined, and if the men had wanted to, they could

have walked upon them. They were saying: 'Allahu Akbar, Subhan Allah, Allahu Akbar.'" (Tarikh Khalifah, p.198, with an authentic chain).

Then the people of the fitna began to throw arrows at Umm al-Mu'minin's camel, and Ali screamed at them to stop attacking the camel, but they did not listen. The camel became like a porcupine from the numerous arrows stuck in it. (Al-Tabari, 4/513, 533, from Saif ibn Umar).

Al-Ashtar approached the camel, and Ibn al-Zubayr stood before him and they fought. This is corroborated by another narration reported by Ibn Abi Shaiba in Al-Musannaf (11/108) and (15/257), with trustworthy narrators: Al-Ashtar and Ibn al-Zubayr met, and Ibn al-Zubayr said: "I did not strike him once until he struck me five or six times. Then he threw me to the ground and said: 'By Allah, were it not for your kinship to the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ), I would not have left a single limb of yours intact.'" Aisha said: "Woe to Asma." Later, the one who had given her the news that he was alive received ten thousand dirhams.

As for the story of the struggle between Ibn al-Zubayr and Al-Ashtar and Ibn al-Zubayr's saying "Kill me and Malik," it is contradicted by authentic reports. Al-Tabari (4/520) narrated with an authentic chain from Alqama that Al-Ashtar met Ibn al-Zubayr on the day of Jamal and said: "I was not satisfied with the strength of my arm, so I stood in the stirrup and struck him on his head, and he fell to the ground." They asked: "Is he the one who said 'Kill me and Malik'?" He replied: "No, I did not leave him with anything in my heart. That was Abd al-Rahman ibn Attab ibn Asid. He met me, and we exchanged two strikes. I knocked him down, and he knocked me down. He kept saying 'Kill me and Malik,' and they did not know who Malik was, so had they known, they would have killed me." Ibn Abi Shaiba also narrated it in Al-Musannaf (15/228).

At this point, Al-Qaqa reached the camel and feared that Umm al-Mu'minin would be harmed. He began calling for a retreat. The camel carried *Muhammad ibn Talha ibn Ubayd Allah, who was killed (may Allah be pleased with him). Al-Qaqa took the camel and pulled it out of the battlefield.

Ibn Abi Shaiba narrated in Al-Musannaf (15/285) with an authentic chain that Abd Allah ibn Badil said to Aisha: "O Umm al-Mu'minin, do you know that I came to you when Uthman was killed and asked you what you commanded, and you said: 'Stick to Ali?' I remained silent. Then I said: 'Strike the camel,' and they struck it. I and her brother Muhammad came down, and we carried the howdah until we placed it before Ali, who ordered that it be placed in Abd Allah ibn Badil's house." It was also mentioned by Al-Hafiz in Fath (13/62).

Then Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) issued orders that no one should pursue the fleeing soldiers or take prisoners. The people of the fitna became angry and said: "Is it lawful for us to shed their blood but not to take their women and their wealth?" Ali said: "Who among you wants Aisha as his share?" They remained silent. He then called out: "Do not kill the wounded, and do not kill those who are fleeing. Whoever shuts his door and lays down his weapon is safe." (Al-Bayhaqi in Al-Sunan al-Kubra, 8/182 and Ibn Abi Shaiba in Al-Musannaf 15/257 and 15/286, with an authentic chain).

Al-Shafi'i narrated in Al-Umm (4/308) from the narration of Ali ibn al-Husayn ibn Ali ibn Abi Talib who said: "I entered upon Marwan ibn al-Hakam, and he said: 'I have never seen

anyone more honorable than your father. When we took command on the day of Jamal, he ordered his herald to announce: 'Do not kill those fleeing and do not strike the wounded.'" This was also mentioned by Al-Hafiz in Fath (13/62).

Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) used to visit the slain and observe as they were buried. Then he traveled until he entered Basra and passed by Talha, seeing him killed. He began to wipe the dirt off his face and said: "It is dear to me, O Abu Muhammad, to see you lying under the stars of the sky," and then he said: "To Allah, I complain of my sorrow and my grief," and he wept for him and his companions. (Tarikh Dimashq, 25/115 and Asd al-Ghaba by Ibn al-Athir (3/88-89)).

Then he went to the house of Abd Allah ibn Badil al-Khuza'i to visit Aisha and check on her. He said to her: "May Allah forgive you." She replied: "I only intended to reconcile between the people." (Shadharat al-Dhahab by Ibn al-'Imad al-Hanbali, 1/206). Az-Zuhri narrated in Al-Maghazi (p.154) her words: "I only wanted to secure my place among the people, and I never imagined that there would be fighting among the people. Had I known this, I would never have taken that position." This is the correct understanding, contrary to what others have said, that Aisha stayed in the house of Abd Allah ibn Khalaf al-Khuza'i.

Then Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) arranged for Aisha to be sent to Makkah with honor and respect. This action of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) is in compliance with what the Prophet (ﷺ) had advised him. Imam Ahmad narrated in Al-Musnad (6/393) with a good chain of narrators from Abu Rafi' (may Allah be pleased with him) that the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said to Ali (may Allah be pleased with him): "There will be an affair between you and Aisha." He asked: "Will I be the one who harms her, O Messenger of Allah?" The Prophet (ﷺ) said: "No, but when that happens, return her to her safe place."

Al-Hakim narrated in Al-Mustadrak (3/119) from Umm Salama (may Allah be pleased with her) who said: "The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) mentioned the departure of some of the mothers of the believers, and Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) laughed. He said: 'Look, O Humayra, do not be the one.' Then he turned to Ali and said: 'If you take charge of her matter, be gentle with her.'"

The departure of Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) on the day of Jamal is considered an error made with good intentions, which was reconciliation. She regretted it, and the Prophet (ﷺ) told her that she would be his wife in paradise, as narrated in Al-Mustadrak. 'Ammar said: "By Allah, she is the wife of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) in this world and the next," as stated in Sahih in this meaning. And with these two pieces of evidence and the description of Allah in the Qur'an calling her "pure," the tongues of the Rawafid who slander the companions of the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) and Umm al-Mu'minin (may Allah be pleased with her) are silenced. (As-Sahih al-Musnad min Dalail al-Nubuwwah by Sheikh Muqbil al-Wadi'i, p.417 in the margin).

She (may Allah be pleased with her) would weep when reading the verse {And stay in your houses} [Al-Ahzab, 33:33] until her veil became soaked. When she would remember the battle of Jamal, she said: "I wish I had sat where my companions sat." In another narration from Ibn Abi Shaiba: "I wish I had been a tender branch and not followed this path." (Siyar A'lam al-Nubala by Al-Dhahabi 2/177, Majma' al-Zawa'id by Al-Haythami 7/238, and Ibn Abi Shaiba in Al-Musannaf 15/281).

Reason dictates that one must acknowledge the error of one of the two fighting parties in which hundreds were killed. Without a doubt, Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) was the one in error for many reasons and clear evidence, such as her regret for leaving. This is fitting for her virtue and perfection, which shows that her error was a forgiven and even rewarded mistake.

Imam al-Zaylai in Nasb al-Rayah said: "Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) clearly expressed regret, as Ibn Abd al-Barr narrated in Al-Istidhkar from Ibn Abi Atiq – Abd Allah ibn Muhammad ibn Abdul-Rahman ibn Abi Bakr al-Siddiq – that Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) said to Ibn Umar: 'O Abu Abd al-Rahman, what stopped you from forbidding me from going?' He replied: 'I saw a man who had influence over you – meaning Ibn al-Zubayr.' She said: 'By Allah, had you forbidden me, I would not have gone.'" Sheikh al-Albani (may Allah have mercy on him) mentioned this in Al-Sahihah. Al-Dhahabi in Siyar A'lam al-Nubala said: "According to Qays, Aisha (may Allah be pleased with her) used to say to herself that she wished to be buried next to the wives of the Prophet (ﷺ), for she regretted her departure on the day of Jamal completely and repented from it, as she only did it out of interpretation, seeking good, just as Talha and Az-Zubayr and others did."

From the great companions, may Allah be pleased with them all. See: Al-Silsila al-Sahihah (1/854-855).

Ibn Taymiyyah, in Minhaj al-Sunnah (4/316-317, 321-322) and (6/208, 363), says that Aisha did not go out for fighting, but rather she went with the intention of reconciling between the people and thought that her going out would be beneficial for the Muslims. Later, she realized that staying at home would have been better, and when she remembered her departure, she would weep until her veil became wet. This was the case with most of the early Muslims, who regretted the fighting they were involved in. Talha and Az-Zubayr (may Allah be pleased with them all) also regretted it.

Imam Al-Qurtubi, in his Tafseer (8/321-322) on the interpretation of Surah Al-Hujurat, states: "It is not permissible to attribute a clear mistake to any of the companions, for they all acted based on their ijtihaḍ (juridical effort) and intended only the pleasure of Allah, the Exalted. This is in light of the numerous reports from various sources from the Prophet (ﷺ) that Talha is a martyr walking on the earth" – referring to the hadith of Abu Huraira in Sahih Muslim (4/1880), where the Prophet (ﷺ) was on Hira' Mountain with Abu Bakr, Umar, Uthman, Ali, Talha, and Az-Zubayr. A rock moved, and the Prophet (ﷺ) said: "Be still; there is no one on this mountain except a prophet, a truthful one (i.e., Abu Bakr), or a martyr." Al-Tirmidhi (5/644), and see Kitab Fada'il al-Sahabah by al-Nasa'i (p.113) and Ibn Majah in Fada'il Talha (1/46), and Al-Asfahani in Al-Imamah (p.371-372). Had their participation in the battle been disobedience, they would not have been considered martyrs by death. Moreover, it is established that the one who killed Az-Zubayr would be in the Hellfire, as narrated from Ali (may Allah be pleased with him), and he said: "I heard the Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) say: 'Give the killer of Ibn Safiya the glad tidings of Hell' – this hadith has been mentioned previously." If that were the case, Talha and Az-Zubayr would not have been exempt from disobedience or sin for fighting, meaning their actions were excused based on their ijtihaḍ. If that were not true, the Prophet (ﷺ) would not have said that Talha is a martyr, nor would he have stated that the killer of Az-Zubayr would be in Hell. Thus,

there would have been no reason to curse them, disown them, or invalidate their virtues and their jihad. May Allah be pleased with them.

Therefore, if it is accepted that the companions, may Allah be pleased with them, are capable of error as any human is, we can accept that the mistakes in their actions were unintentional, resulting from ijtihad that did not succeed in reaching the correct path. However, they will be rewarded for their sincerity in their efforts, if Allah wills.

It was wrong for anyone to claim that Talha and Az-Zubayr went out due to their desire for the caliphate or their conspiring against the people.

Ibn Shabah in his book Akhbar al-Basra rejects this claim, stating that no one transmitted that Aisha and those with her contested Ali's caliphate, nor did they call for someone else to take the caliphate. They only opposed Ali for delaying the punishment of the killers of Uthman and not exacting retribution from them. This was narrated by Al-Hafiz in Al-Fath (13/60-61).

Ibn Hazm in Al-Fasl fi al-Milal (4/238-239) states: "It is undeniably true that they did not go to Basra to fight Ali, to dispute his caliphate, or to revoke his allegiance. Had they intended this, they would have created a new pledge of allegiance, something which no one doubts. Therefore, it is proven that their journey to Basra was to close the rift in the Muslim community caused by the unjust killing of Ameer al-Mu'mineen Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him)."

The meeting of the two factions at Jamal occurred on a Thursday in the middle of Jumada al-Akhirah in the year 36 AH, according to Tareekh Khalifah (p.184-185) – this is the most authentic narration regarding the date of the Jamal battle. The fighting began after the Dhuhr prayer and continued until the sun set, and around the camel was one of those who were defending it. This was narrated by Al-Hafiz in Al-Fath (13/62).

As for the number of casualties in the battle of Jamal, historians have exaggerated the numbers, with some citing very low numbers and others very high, depending on their biases and inclinations. However, the true number of casualties in the battle of Jamal was very small for the following reasons:

1. The short duration of the fighting, as Ibn Abi Shaiba narrated with a sound chain of narrators that the fighting began after the Dhuhr prayer and lasted until the sun set, and around the camel was one who was defending it.

2. The defensive nature of the battle, where each side was only defending itself.

3. The reluctance of both sides to engage in combat due to their awareness of the great sanctity of the blood of a Muslim.

- 4 - Compared to the number of Muslim martyrs in the Battle of Yarmouk - three thousand martyrs, Tareekh al-Tabari (3/402) - and the Battle of Qadisiyyah - eight thousand five hundred martyrs, Tareekh al-Tabari (3/564) - which lasted for several days, the actual number of casualties in the Battle of Jamal is considered very small. This is despite the fierceness and intensity of these battles as they were decisive in the history of nations.

5 - Khalifah ibn Khayyat in his history (p.187-190) lists the names of those who were preserved from the casualties of the Jamal day, and they numbered nearly one hundred. If we assume the number was two hundred and not one hundred, this would mean the casualties in the Battle of Jamal did not exceed two hundred. This is the more likely scenario based on the previously mentioned reasons, and Allah knows best. See regarding this topic the book: Shahadat Uthman and the Battle of Jamal by Khalid Al-Ghaith (p.214-215).

This number is in accordance with the hadith of the Prophet (ﷺ) as narrated by Al-Bazzar from Ibn Abbas (may Allah be pleased with them both), where he said: The Messenger of Allah (ﷺ) said to his wives: "I wonder which of you is the one with the adorned camel who will leave, and the dogs of Hawab will bark at her, killing many on her right and left, and then she will escape after nearly perishing." Al-Silsila al-Sahihah (1/853).

The fate of Ibn Saba after these events.

There are multiple reports about the fate of Abdullah ibn Saba, whether he was burned with his followers or whether he was exiled with others to Subat in Al-Mada'in.

I say: The more likely scenario, and Allah knows best, is that he was exiled to Subat and died there; there is much evidence for this, and here is a summary of it:

First: The evidence that Ali burned his group, without mentioning burning Ibn Saba with them:

The report of Ali ibn Abi Talib (may Allah be pleased with him) burning a group of Saba'iyyah is found in the authentic reports in Sahih and Sunan books. See his report with them in Sahih al-Bukhari (4/21), (8/50), Abu Dawood in his Sunan (4/520), An-Nasa'i (7/104), At-Tirmidhi (4/59), Al-Hakim in Al-Mustadrak (3/538-539), and Al-Albani authenticated it in Sahih Abu Dawood (3/822).

Imam Al-Bukhari narrated from Ikrimah (the freed slave of Ibn Abbas) that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) was brought a group of zindiq (heretics), and he burned them. When Ibn Abbas heard this, he said: "Had I been the one, I would not have burned them, for the Prophet (ﷺ) prohibited the punishment by Allah's punishment. I would have killed them, for the Prophet (ﷺ) said: 'Whoever changes his religion, kill him.'" Sahih al-Bukhari with Al-Fath (12/279).

Al-Juzajani in Ahwal al-Rijal (p.37-38) and Ibn Hajar in Al-Fath (12/270) with a good chain mentioned that the Saba'iyyah went to extremes in disbelief, claiming that Ali was God. So, Ali burned them in denial of their belief, and it was a sign of his clarity in the matter when he said:

"When I saw the matter as something abhorrent, I kindled the fire and called Qunbur."

Ibn Qutaybah in Ta'weel Mukhtalif al-Hadith (p.78-79) and in Al-Ma'arif (p.267) said that Abdullah ibn Saba claimed divinity for Ali, and Ali burned his companions.

Ibn Hajar in Lisan al-Mizan (3/389-390) said: Abdullah ibn Saba was one of the extreme heretics, and he had followers known as the Saba'iyyah who believed in the divinity of Ali ibn Abi Talib. Ali burned them during his caliphate.

Ibn Hazm in *Al-Fasl fi al-Milal wa al-Nahl* (4/186) stated: "The second group of the extreme sects were those who believed in divinity for someone other than Allah, and the first of them were the followers of Abdullah ibn Saba... until they openly declared: 'You are He.' He asked them, 'Who is He?' They said: 'You are God.' He was horrified by this and ordered a fire to be kindled and burned them."

Al-Fakhr al-Razi also confirmed, like others, the report of Ali burning a group of the Saba'iyyah. See *Aqeedat Ahl al-Sunnah wal-Mushrikun* (p.57).

Second: The evidence that Ali burned his group and burned Abdullah ibn Saba with them:

Al-Mamaqani in *Tanqih al-Maqal* (2/184) mentioned that Ali burned Abdullah ibn Saba with a group of seventy men who claimed divinity and prophethood in him.

Al-Dhahabi in *Mizan al-I'tidal* (2/426) said: "I think Ali burned him" – referring to Abdullah ibn Saba – with fire. Here, he does not assert it conclusively but places it in doubt.

As for Al-Kashi, he firmly stated that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) burned Abdullah ibn Saba along with his companions, and he narrated multiple reports indicating that when Ali heard of Ibn Saba's extremism and his claim to divinity for him, he called him and asked him about it. Ibn Saba admitted to it and was asked to retract, but he refused. Ali imprisoned him, gave him three days to repent, but when he did not, he burned him with fire. See this text in *Al-Nasha' Al-Akbar in Masail al-Imama* (p.22).

Third: Evidence that Ali burned his group, then exiled Ibn Saba to Subat.

Ibn Taymiyyah mentioned in *Minhaj al-Sunnah* (1/23, 30) and (3/459), Ibn Asakir in *Tarikh Dimashq* (29/10), and Al-Malati in *Al-Tanbih wa al-Radd ala Ahl al-Ahwa wa al-Bid'a* (p.29-30): that Ali burned a group of extremist Shia and exiled some of them, including Abdullah ibn Saba.

Al-Baghdadi in *Al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq* (p.223) mentioned that the Saba'iyyah revealed their innovation in Ali's time, so he burned some of them and exiled Ibn Saba to Subat in Al-Mada'in after Ibn Abbas (may Allah be pleased with him) advised him not to kill him. Ibn Abbas suggested exiling him to Mada'in to avoid further conflict, especially as Ali was about to return to fighting the people of Sham.

Al-Shahrastani in *Al-Milal wa al-Nihal* (1/155) stated: The Saba'iyyah were followers of Abdullah ibn Saba who said to Ali (may Allah be pleased with him): "You are You" – meaning God, and so Ali exiled him to Mada'in.

Al-Juzajani in *Ahwal al-Rijal* (p.38) mentioned that one of the claims of Abdullah ibn Saba was that the Qur'an was part of nine parts, and its knowledge was with Ali. Ali exiled him after intending to kill him.

The more likely opinion on this matter is that Ibn Saba was exiled to Subat in Al-Mada'in, as stated by many scholars. The evidence that he was exiled and not burned, as I mentioned earlier, includes that Ibn Saba showed up after the death of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him). It suffices for a researcher to look into these statements found in many sources to realize that Ibn Saba was not burned with his sect:

Ibn Saba said to those who brought him the news of Ali's death: "If you had brought us his head in seventy bags, we would not have believed you. We would have known that he did not die, for he will not die until he drives the Arabs with his staff." Masail al-Imama by Al-Nasha' al-Akbar (p.22), and also refer to the indication of this phrase in Al-Farq Bayn al-Firqah by Al-Baghdadi (p.234), Al-Bidaya wa al-Tarikh by Ibn Tahir al-Maqdisi (5/129), Al-Maqalat wa al-Firqah by Al-Qummi (p.20-21), Al-Bayan wa al-Tabiyan by Al-Jahiz (3/81), Al-Majroohin by Ibn Hibban (1/298), Tathbit Dalail al-Nubuwwa by Al-Hamadhani (2/549), and Firqat al-Shi'a by Al-Nubakhti (p.43).

Al-Safadi in his Tarjama of Ibn Saba mentioned: Ibn Saba was the head of the Saba'iyyah sect... He said to Ali (may Allah be pleased with him): "You are God." Ali exiled him to Mada'in. When Ali was killed, Ibn Saba claimed that he did not die because he had a divine part in him and that Ibn Muljam killed a devil who had assumed the form of Ali. He claimed that Ali was in the clouds, with the thunder being his voice and the lightning his whip, and that he would descend to the earth. Al-Wafi bi al-Wafiyat (17/190).

It was also mentioned in Al-Firqah al-Islamiyya by Al-Karmani (p.34) that when Ali was killed, Abdullah ibn Saba claimed that Ali did not die and that he had the divine part in him.

Abu al-Hasan al-Ash'ari in Maqalat al-Islamiyyin (1/85) listed Abdullah ibn Saba and his sect among the extremists, claiming that Ali did not die and would return to earth to fill it with justice just as it was filled with oppression.

What I have mentioned does not mean that he was not killed by others, but according to my limited knowledge and my review of many books that discuss this topic, there is no mention of such an event.

However, this does not prevent that all those who participated or assisted in the killing of Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him) were either killed or punished by Allah's decree. Allah, the Exalted, did not neglect the oppressors but humiliated them, disgraced them, and took revenge on them, and no one escaped. Here are some examples of that:

Al-Khalifah in his Tareekh (p.175) reported with an authentic chain that the first drop of blood that fell from Uthman's body onto the Mushaf was wiped away.

Ahmad narrated with an authentic chain from Amra bint Artah al-Adawiyyah who said: "I went out with Aisha in the year Uthman was killed to Makkah, and we passed through Medina where we saw the Mushaf of the one who was killed, lying in his lap. The first drop of his blood fell on the verse: {فسيفيكم الله و هو السميع العليم} (So Allah will suffice you against them, and He is the All-Hearing, the All-Knowing). Amra said: 'No man from them died in peace.'" See Fadail al-Sahabah (1/501) with an authentic chain. It was also narrated in Al-Zuhd (p.127-128).

Ibn Asakir narrated in his Tarikh (39/446-447) from Ibn Sirin who said: "I was circumambulating the Kaaba when I heard a man saying, 'O Allah, forgive me, but I do not think You will forgive me!' I said, 'O Abdullah! I have never heard anyone say what you are saying!' He said: 'I had made a vow to Allah that if I had the chance, I would slap Uthman's face. So when he was killed and laid on his bier in the house, and people came to pray over him, I entered as if I were praying for him, and I found myself alone, so I raised the cloth

from his face and slapped his face. My right hand became stiff, and Muhammad ibn Sirin said: 'I saw it dry like a piece of wood.'

And Qatada narrated that a man from Banu Sudus said: "I was among those who killed Uthman, and there was no man from us except that he was struck with punishment except for me. Qatada said: 'He did not die until he became blind.'" Ansab al-Ashraf by Al-Baladhuri (5/102).

Al-Mubarak ibn Fadal narrated: "I heard Al-Hasan al-Basri say: 'I do not know of anyone who participated in the killing of Uthman (may Allah be pleased with him) or assisted in it except that he was killed.' And in another narration: 'The corrupt ones, the murderers of Uthman, were not left by Allah without being killed in every land.'" Tarikh al-Madina al-Munawwarah by Ibn Shabba (4/1252).

The Role of This Jewish Man in the Rise of the Rafidah, and the Religious Aspect of Abdullah ibn Saba in the Fitnah, Leading Muslims Away from Their Faith.

This deceitful Jew, Abdullah ibn Saba, called upon those deceived by him from the common Muslims to adopt some Jewish principles, while disguising his invitation with a pretense of love for the family of the Prophet (Ahl al-Bayt) and advocating for their leadership and distancing from their enemies. This deception misled a group of Bedouins and recent converts to Islam, who eventually became a religious sect that deviated from the Islamic creed and took its ideas and principles from Judaism.

Thus, this sect took the name of its founder and innovator, Ibn Saba, and was called the Saba'iyyah. From the Saba'iyyah, the Rafidah derived their beliefs and foundations, influenced by the Jewish principles that Ibn Saba had promoted.

Therefore, it became well known among scholars that Abdullah ibn Saba was the first to invent Rafidism and that Rafidism was derived from Judaism.

Shaykh al-Islam Ibn Taymiyyah said in Majmu' al-Fatawa (28/483): "Scholars have mentioned that the origin of Rafidism began with the heretic Abdullah ibn Saba, who outwardly embraced Islam but concealed Judaism, seeking to corrupt Islam, as Paul the Christian – who was a Jew – did in corrupting the Christian religion."

He also said in another part of the Fatawa (4/428): "The one who invented Rafidism was a Jew who outwardly embraced Islam as hypocrisy, and he planted deceit among the ignorant, undermining the foundation of faith. Therefore, Rafidism became one of the greatest gates of hypocrisy and heresy."

He also stated in another part of the Fatawa (4/435): "The origin of Rafidism is from the hypocrites and heretics. It was invented by Ibn Saba, the heretic, who exaggerated in his veneration for Ali by claiming the Imamate and explicit designation of him, and he claimed infallibility for him. This is why, when its origin was from hypocrisy, some of the early scholars said: 'Loving Abu Bakr and Umar is faith, and hating them is hypocrisy, and loving the family of Banu Hashim is faith, and hating them is hypocrisy.'"

Ibn Abi al-Izz al-Hanafi in his *Sharh al-Tahawi* (p.578) said: "The origin of Rafidhism was innovated by a hypocritical heretic who aimed to destroy the religion of Islam and cast aspersions on the Prophet (peace be upon him), as scholars have mentioned. When Abdullah ibn Saba outwardly embraced Islam, he sought to corrupt Islam through his deceit and malice, just as Paul did in Christianity. He pretended to be pious, then started calling for *Amr bil Ma'ruf* (enjoining good) and *Nahi an al-Munkar* (forbidding evil), until he caused the *Fitnah* and led to the killing of Uthman."

Modern studies have also confirmed that the origin of Rafidhism is Jewish, and its founder was a deceitful Jew who wanted to corrupt the Muslims' faith and lead them astray from the true religion. Abdullah al-Qasim says in his book *The Struggle Between Islam and Paganism* (1/11), after discussing the phenomenon of exaggeration in the veneration of Ali ibn Abi Talib: "As for the one who planted the seeds of this misguidance and took the lead in it, Abdullah ibn Saba, he was sought by Ali to inflict upon him the most severe punishment, but he was as cautious as a raven, so he fled and left the country. His flight was not to escape the burden of this devastating *fitnah* or to admit defeat, but rather it was an attempt to preserve his ideas from burial and death so that he could mislead the Muslims and cause discord among the confused, and so that it would remain an embarrassment and a fire until the Day of Judgment. The claims and innovations of this man spread everywhere, echoing bitterly and disturbingly throughout the Islamic kingdom, shaking hearts and ears, making some hearts and ears rejoice. Its echoes were repeated by the mouths created for this purpose, and were echoed by others. The repetition went on for so long that it reached weak hearts, and when it settled in, it became a fixed belief for them, and blood was spilled in its name. People began to hate their own families and companions for it, and it later became known as the Shiite sect and its beliefs."

As for Ihsan Ilahi Zahir (may Allah have mercy on him), after extensive research in the books of the Rafidah, which gave him more expertise in understanding their beliefs and doctrines, he confirms that their ideology is based on Jewish principles through Abdullah ibn Saba. He says: "As for the religion of the Imamis and the Twelver sect, it is nothing but based on the foundations laid by the evil Jews through Abdullah ibn Saba, the Yemeni, famously known as Ibn al-Sawda." See: *Shia and Sunni* (p.29).

These quotes from the books of the Ahl al-Sunnah confirm that the origin of Rafidhism was introduced by Abdullah ibn Saba, the Jew, and that the Rafidah have nothing to do with Islam.

This has also been acknowledged by prominent Shiite scholars and historians.

Al-Kashshi—one of their prominent scholars of biographies in the 4th century (d. 340 AH)—cites this text from some of their scholars, saying: "Some scholars mentioned that Abdullah ibn Saba was a Jew who embraced Islam and supported Ali ibn Abi Talib. He used to say, while still on his Jewish faith, that Yusha ibn Nun was the successor of Musa with exaggeration, and after the death of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), he said the same about Ali—that he was the successor of the Prophet, and he was the first to proclaim the obligatory imamate of Ali and openly distanced himself from his enemies, and declared the disbelievers among those who opposed him. From here, those who opposed the Shi'a say that the origin of **Tashayyu'* and Rafidhism is taken from Judaism." See: *Rijal al-Kashshi* (p.71).

This text is well-known among the Shiite scholars and has been transmitted by them in many of their authoritative and trusted books.

It was mentioned by Al-Ash'ari al-Qummi (d. 301 AH) in *Al-Maqalat wa al-Firaq* (p.20), when he says: "From here, those who oppose the Shi'a say that the origin of Rafidhism is taken from Judaism."

It was mentioned by Al-Nubakhti (d. 310 AH) in *Firaq al-Shi'a* (p.44), when he says: "From here, those who oppose the Shi'a say that the origin of Rafidhism is taken from the Jews."

It was mentioned by Al-Mamaqani (d. 1351 AH) in *Tanqih al-Maqal* (2/184).

These are prominent historians and researchers from the Shi'a who acknowledge the Jewish origin of Ibn Saba and that he claimed the same ideas in Islam regarding Ali ibn Abi Talib as he had about Yusha ibn Nun in Judaism, and that he was the first to call for the imamate of Ali ibn Abi Talib (may Allah be pleased with him) and to dissociate from his opponents. They then agree that the Rafidah are linked to Judaism for this reason.

Thus, this acknowledgment by the major Shiite scholars serves as the greatest evidence that the origin of Rafidhism is derived from Judaism, and it is binding upon anyone who doubts this truth, including contemporary Shiite scholars and those influenced by their writings.

Just as the books of both Sunni and Shiite scholars have indicated that the origin of Rafidhism comes from Judaism through Abdullah ibn Saba, so too do the works of Orientalists testify to this.

The German orientalist Julius Wellhausen says: "The origin of the Saba'iyyah goes back to the time of Ali and Hasan and is attributed to Abdullah ibn Saba. As can be deduced from his strange name, he was also a Yemeni, and in fact, he was from the capital Sana'a. It is also said that he was a Jew, and this leads to the conclusion that the origin of the Saba'iyyah sect is Jewish. Muslims often refer to Jews as those who are not actually Jews. However, it seems that the Shia sect, attributed to Abdullah ibn Saba as its founder, is closer to originating from the Jews than from the Iranians." *Khawarij and Shia* (p. 170–171).

As for the Hungarian orientalist Ignaz Goldziher, he believes that the concept of the Mahdi and the doctrine of Raj'ah (return) among the Rafidah were influenced by Judaism and Christianity, and that the exaggeration about Ali was formulated by Abdullah ibn Saba, the Jew. He says: "The Mahdism idea, which led to the theory of Imamate and manifested in the belief in Raj'ah, should all be attributed— as we have seen—to Jewish and Christian influences. The excessive deification of Ali, which was initially formulated by Abdullah ibn Saba, occurred in a Semitic environment that had not yet been influenced by Aryan ideas." See: *The Doctrine and Law of Islam* (p. 205).

These statements from scholars of both Sunni and Shia backgrounds, as well as Orientalists, all confirm that the origin of Rafidhism is from Judaism, and that its founder and innovator in Islam was Abdullah ibn Saba, the Jew. This also points to the fact that Rafidhism originated from Judaism, supported by a number of pieces of evidence:

First: The beliefs of the Rafidah that distinguish them from other Islamic sects, such as the belief in Wasi'ah (succession) of Ali, Raj'ah (return), Bidayah (initiation), Taqiyyah (concealment), and the extreme veneration of their Imams, have no basis in Islam. There is no text, whether from the Qur'an or the Sunnah, that supports these beliefs. Rather, the Qur'an, Sunnah, and the consensus of the Ummah testify to the invalidity of these beliefs and the innocence of Islam from them.

As for the proofs the Rafidah present to validate these beliefs, they are either correct but irrelevant, or fabricated and unfit for use as evidence. Most of their evidence falls into this second category. Since they could not find legitimate sources in the Shari'ah to support their beliefs, they began fabricating narrations attributed to the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) and Ali ibn Abi Talib and his descendants to support their corrupt beliefs. For this reason, it has become well-known among scholars that the Rafidah are the most deceptive sects that claim to follow Islam, and they are warned against for their lies.

Second: The beliefs of the Rafidah that distinguish them from other Islamic sects have their roots in Judaism. I have traced these beliefs and found that they either stem from pure Jewish doctrine or have origins in Jewish teachings.

Third: Scholars from both Sunni and Shia traditions explicitly state that the first to introduce the exaggeration of Ali and the doctrines of Wasi'ah (succession) and Raj'ah (return) was Abdullah ibn Saba, the Jew. We have previously mentioned the texts cited by Al-Ash'ari al-Qummi, Al-Kashshi, Al-Nubakhti, and Al-Mamaqani, which acknowledge that Abdullah ibn Saba was the first to introduce the belief in the Wasi'ah of Ali ibn Abi Talib and the obligatory Imamate of Ali, while disassociating from his opponents.

Al-Shahrastani mentions in *Al-Milal wa al-Nihal* (1/174) that Abdullah ibn Saba was the first to openly declare that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) was appointed by the Prophet to be his successor, and from him arose the different groups of extremists. He talks about the Saba'iyyah saying: "They were the first to say that Ali was appointed by the Prophet, to believe in the occultation and return, and to believe in the transmigration of the divine essence in the Imams after Ali."

Al-Maqrizi mentions in *Al-Khitat* (2/356–357) that Abdullah ibn Saba introduced the belief in the Prophet's Wasi'ah to Ali during Ali's time and also introduced the belief in Raj'ah, that Ali would return after death to the world.

When we understand the significance of these beliefs— which scholars have confirmed were first introduced into Islam by Abdullah ibn Saba, the Jew— we realize the substantial role the Jews played in the formation of Rafidhism.

Fourth: Abdullah ibn Saba himself stated that he took the doctrine of Wasi'ah (succession) from the Torah. Al-Baghdadi mentioned in *Al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq* (p. 235) from Al-Sha'bi that Ibn al-Sawda (i.e., Abdullah ibn Saba) told the people of Kufa that he found in the Torah that every prophet had a successor, and that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) was the successor of Muhammad (peace be upon him) and the best of successors, just as Muhammad was the best of prophets.

If we make a quick comparison between some of the beliefs of the Shia, we find that they align with some of the beliefs of the Saba'iyyah, as shown in the following comparison:

Saba'iyyah (Jewish beliefs)

1. Raj'ah (Return): The return of Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) to the world before the Day of Judgment, a concept taken from the Old Testament – the distorted version. See: Chapter (4) verse: 5.

Shia (Rafidi) beliefs

1. It is mentioned in *Awail al-Maqalat* by Al-Mufid (p. 51): "The Imamiyyah agree on the necessity of the return of many of the dead to the world before the Day of Judgment, although there is a difference among them regarding the meaning of Raj'ah."

Saba'iyyah (Jewish beliefs)

2. Wasi'ah (Succession): The will of the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) to Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) regarding his caliphate after him, a concept taken from the Old Testament – the distorted version. See: Chapter (34) verse: 9.

Shia (Rafidi) beliefs

2. It is mentioned in *Al-Kafi* by Al-Kulaini (1/294): "So Ali (peace be upon him) had the right of Wasi'ah that was appointed to him, the greatest name, the inheritance of knowledge, and the effects of prophetic knowledge."

Saba'iyyah (Jewish beliefs)

3. Divinity: Among the consequences of divinity is that Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) knows the unseen. See *Al-Du'afa wa al-Matrukin* by Ibn Hibban (3/8), *Mizan al-I'tidal* by Al-Dhahabi (4/161), and *Al-Maqalat wa al-Firaq* by Al-Qummi (p. 21), where they all mention that the Saba'iyyah believed Ali (may Allah be pleased with him) had the power to bring the dead back to life and was satisfied with his divinity. However, he burned those who revealed this secret and later revived them, and he knew the unseen.

Shia (Rafidi) beliefs

3. Among the implications of divinity, as mentioned in *Al-Kafi* by Al-Kulaini (1/258): "When the Imam wishes to know, he knows." Furthermore, he titled a chapter: "The Imams know when they will die, and they do not die except by their own choice." Also, Khomeini states in *Al-Hukumat al-Islamiyyah* (p. 47): "The Imam has a praised status and a high degree, and a cosmic caliphate, to which all particles of the universe are subject to his sovereignty."

Saba'iyyah (Jewish beliefs)

4. Ali's knowledge of nine-tenths of the Qur'an, which the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him) hid! See: *Abdullah ibn Saba and His Impact on the Events of the Fitnah in Early Islam* by Dr. Sulaiman al-Awdah (p. 207).

Shia (Rafidi) beliefs

4. It is mentioned in Al-Kafi (1/239) a narration attributed to Ja'far al-Sadiq that says: "We have the Mushaf of Fatimah (may Allah be pleased with her). The narrator says: I asked: What is the Mushaf of Fatimah? He replied: It is a Mushaf containing what is similar to your Qur'an three times, but not a single letter of your Qur'an is in it."

Saba'iyyah (Jewish beliefs)

5. Cursing the Companions, especially the three caliphs who ruled before Ali (may Allah be pleased with him), namely Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman (may Allah be pleased with them). See Firaq al-Shi'ah by Al-Nubakhti (p. 43–44) and Al-Maqalat wa al-Firaq by Al-Qummi (p. 20).

Shia (Rafidi) beliefs

5. It is mentioned in Al-Kafi (1/32) when they claim the verse: "Indeed, those who believed and then disbelieved, then believed and then disbelieved, then increased in disbelief, never will their repentance be accepted" (note that this text merges two different verses from the Qur'an: Surah An-Nisa' [137] and Aal-e-Imran [90]): "It was revealed about so-and-so, so-and-so, and so-and-so, who initially believed in the Prophet Muhammad (peace be upon him), but disbelieved when the Wilayah (leadership) was presented to them." These names refer to Abu Bakr, Umar, and Uthman (may Allah be pleased with them), as clarified by the Sharh of Al-Kafi! Quoted from Shia and Sunni by Ihsan Ilahi Zahir (p. 42). Also, Al-Mufid mentioned in Awa'il al-Maqalat (p. 48): "The Imamiyyah, Zaydis, and Khawarij all agree that the Nakisheen (those who broke their pledge), Qasiteen (those who unjustly opposed the rightful ruler), and Maraqsheen (those who opposed Ali) of Basra and Sham are all disbelievers, misguided, cursed for waging war against Ameer al-Mu'mineen (Ali), and they will be in Hell forever!" After this, one may still claim that the Zaydis are the closest Shia sect to the Sunnis!!

Saba'iyyah (Jewish beliefs)

6. Bida'ah (Innovation): The emergence of a new opinion that did not exist before, a belief that stems from the Saba'iyyah, which implies the appearance of what was hidden from Allah. See: Al-Tanbeeh wa al-Radd by Al-Malti (p. 19) and Al-Farq Bayn al-Firaq (p. 36).

Shia (Rafidi) beliefs

6. It is mentioned in Al-Kafi by Al-Kulaini (1/146–148) after he compiled the Book of Tawhid and titled a chapter Al-Bida'ah: "If people knew the reward in speaking about Bida'ah, they would never cease talking about it."

Thus, these proofs, in addition to the quotes from some scholars from both Sunni and Shia traditions and the testimony of some Orientalists, confirm the role of Abdullah ibn Saba in the formation of Rafidhism and the origin of Rafidhism being taken from Judaism.

In conclusion, we have reached the end of this series on Abdullah ibn Saba, and until we meet again, I leave you with the protection of Allah. Peace and blessings be upon you, and praise be to Allah for His grace and guidance.

With my regards,

Your brother: Abu Abdullah al-Dhahabi

Translated by: The One in Need of Allah

Endnote:

I urgently pray to Allah, the Most Merciful, that He guides my dear friends and protects them from being deceived by the falsehoods and innovations of the Shia sect. May He open their hearts to the truth of Islam and grant them the wisdom to stay steadfast in the righteous path. May Allah keep us all firm in our faith and safeguard us from misguidance. Ameen.